ard

A

VIEW

OF THE

Pontificate:

From its ſuppoſed BEGINNING,
To the End of
The Council of TRENT,
A. D. 1563.

IN WHICH,

The Corruptions of the Scriptures and Sacred Antiquity, Forgeries in the Councils, and Incroachments of the Court of *Rome* on the Church and State, to ſupport their Infallibility, Supremacy, and other Modern Doctrines, are ſet in a true Light.

By *LAURENCE HOWEL*, A. M.

LONDON:
Printed by *John Nutt*, and ſold by *John Pemberton* at the *Golden Buck* againſt St. *Dunſtan's* C. .rch in *Fleetſtreet*. MDCCXII.

DEO Opt. Max.

ET

SS. Matri Ecclesiæ,

Omni Supplex Humilitate,

D. D.

L. H.

THE PREFACE.

I *Can not address the Reader with any Thing more suitable to the Occasion of these Sheets, than the Motto with which the Pious and Learned Doctor* James *concludes his Preface,* Verum amo, & Verum volo mihi dici. *Truth is the great End which all our honest Endeavours ought to aim at; and, if in the Pursuit of it we are sincere, we can not fail of acquiring a right Knowledge of it. Truth never shuns the Light, but will bear the nicest Scrutiny; needs no spurious Tracts and forg'd Legends to enforce it, and despises those mean Arts of corrupting Words, and distorting the Sense of genuine Authorities to support Innovations: Which have been the Occasion of those wild Mazes of intricate and perplex'd Controversies, wherewith the Schoolmen, and the more modern Champions of the Pontificate, have defended many erroneous Doctrines and Practices of the* Church *of* Rome; *in some Things obscuring, and in others totally obliterating Truth; and which, if carefully inquired into, must undoubtedly very much add to the Confusion her Proselytes labour under; who, if they exercise their Reason, must renounce their Religion. This, as the excellent Author of the* Whole Duty of Man *usefully observes, makes out the happy Disparity be-*

tween

tween the Church of Rome *and Us: For, among the many remarkable Impresses of Truth our* Church *bears, it is one, That she does not blindfold her Proselytes, but leaves them the Use of their Faculties; and does not, by obtruding on them an Implicit Belief, force them to lay down their Reason when they take up their Faith. For evident Proof of this, I refer the Reader to the following Sheets.*

Of all Things in the World, Religion is of the highest Consequence; not only our present, but future Well-being depending thereon; and therefore, in Matters relating to it, we ought to have the nearest Concern: For the Truth of which, we can appeal no whither so safely as to the Genuine Holy Scriptures, and uncorrupted Antiquity. And yet both of these, in the several Popish Editions, are so stuffed with Variations, Contradictions, Forgeries, &c. *that it is impossible to come at the Truth by them. As to the Variety and Contrariety of the Popish Bibles, Doctor* James *hath sufficiently exposed them in his* Corruption of the Holy Scriptures, &c. *And as to the* Forgeries in the Councils, *Doctor* Comber *hath exceeded all that went before him, very plainly and methodically taking Notice of the most remarkable Occurrences to the Middle of the* Sixth Century: *A Period of Time memorable for the most important Transactions in the Church. This excellent Method of Dr.* Comber's, *and the late Opportunity I had of conversing with the Councils, in composing my* Synopsis *of the* Canons *of the* Greek *and* Latin Churches, *were the Motives that induced me to this Undertaking, which I have carried on to the End of the Council of* Trent; *to which Time I have remarked*

marked the most notorious Abuses the Church suffered from the several Bishops *of* Rome, *who sacrificed all that lay in their Way to serve the Ends of their aspiring Ambition, and lay the Foundation of their future Grandeur.*

Certainly, nothing has so much contributed to the Disrespect of the Christian Religion *in General, as the prostituting it to vile secular Purposes; which having once gain'd Footing in the Church, made Way for many Superstitions to creep into her Worship. These were attended with many and dangerous Consequences; for when the Friends of the* Pontificate *had by a vast Train of forg'd* Decretal Epistles, Sham-Councils, *and base* Corruptions *of the* Holy Scriptures, *and the most early Writers, secur'd, and (as they thought) lodg'd the* Supremacy *in the* Bishop *of* Rome, *they cast about how to invest him with Temporal Power. This they were not long in doing; for when they had, in Matters of* Faith *and* Divine Worship, *persuaded, or rather aw'd, all within their Power into their Opinion, they had nothing to do but to triumph over that Part of Mankind, whose Reason they had crippled and enslaved.*

School-Divinity *(next to Force) contributed very much to this Change of* Religion *in the Minds of Men; and being more amusing than instructing, it's very much to be fear'd, has furnished our modern* Enthusiasts *with their whimsical and dangerous Notions of* God *and his true* Religion. *And if we examine more strictly into the Practices of several Popes in relation to Church-Discipline, we shall find, that by their unlawfully commissioning the Laity to exercise the* Sacerdotal Office, *as in the Case of*

Baptism,

Baptism, they were the Source from whence our Sectaries *drew their Principles.*

By whom was Rebellion more enforc'd than by such eminent Exemplars of it as the Popes, who with an arm'd Force have often confronted their Sovereigns? Whence the Deposing-Doctrine, *(too much since imitated) but from the impious Example of Popes, who have dethron'd Kings, and proudly trod upon the Necks of Emperors? Whence that juggling Distinction of the* * Double Capacity *of Princes, so destructive to Crown'd Heads, but from the Champions of the* Pontificate? *Whence so many false Notions of the Deity and its Worship, but from their fabulous Narratives and ridiculous Forgeries? And whence those distorted Interpretations of Sacred Writ, but from their disingenuous Glosses and Prostitution of it to base Ends? In short, it has been their Business to sow Dissention in all Parts of the Christian World, where they had not immediate Power, that by their fatal Divisions they might more easily devour; engaging Kings in their Quarrel against their Subjects, and supporting Children and Subjects in most unnatural Rebellions against their Parents and Sovereigns. By these Means the Wicked have been encouraged to go on in their Ways, and the Minds of honest well-meaning Men too often been debauched and ensnared, under Pretence of promoting the Service of God and their Prince, to despise both.*

* p. 282.

THE

THE HISTORY OF THE Pontificate.

IT would be difficult to resolve, whether the Church of Christ hath suffered more by the Barbarity of Heathens, or by the unfaithful Editions of the Councils, and their more unfair Commentaries. For wherever Paganism raged, there the Word of God flourish'd with the Increase of fresh Confessors; and the more the Earth was inrich'd with the Blood of Martyrs, the more the Faith of Christ grew and improv'd, thriving under Persecution, and triumphing in Death.

Nor did the Ignorance of the ancient Monks add more to the Darkness of those Times than the studied Corruptions and vile Contaminations of the best Authors have in later Days: For what they through Carelessness and want of Skill neglected and overlook'd, these most industriously have adulterated, and by repeated Fictions and Impositions frequently suppress'd, and too often stifled Truth. And to support their tottering Supremacy,

and imaginary Infallibility, they will blacken the brightest Truths, nay, will not stick to prophane the very Sacred Scripture it self with partial and subtile Interpretations.

A manifest Instance of this we have in a Book entituled, *Liber Pontificalis*, which treats of the Lives of the Prelates of *Rome*, and is supposed by some to have been written by Pope *Damasus*; tho' the Annotator will not allow it to be Pope *Damasus*'s, but patch'd up out of two several Authors. *Labb. p.* 63. *Bin. p.* 19. *col.* 2. What Repute a Book deserves from Strangers, whose Authority is questioned by its own Asserters, let any one judge. Yet this Book, infamous as it is, passes with the Papists for genuine, who in their Annotations give it the Character of a true and undoubted History. This is the Spring from whence have flow'd those numerous adulterate Epistles, spurious Decrees, and ridiculous Fables, and from whence almost all the Divines of that Church have endeavoured to prove their late Doctrines and Practices descended from the Infancy of Christianity to these very Days in a clear and uninterrupted Succession, and were the Belief and Practice of the earliest Fathers of the Church.

And although it is apparently true that this same *Liber Pontificalis* is for the most Part a Heap of Fictions, first of all giving an Account only of the Names and Years of the Popes, and then, out of that infamous *Isidor Mercator*, stuffed with Decretal Epistles and other *Romish* Additions, agreeable neither to the Ages nor Men of whom they treat. And though it is unquestionably true, that these *Decretal Epistles* were forg'd for no other End than to make the World believe, not only that the Bishops of *Rome* in all Ages made the greatest Figure in the Church, but that their very Presbyters bore

the

the Pre-eminence over all others. Yet this very Heap of Contradictions have the Editors not only palm'd upon the World for genuine Truths, but out of these very Forgeries, on their Festivals, they appoint the Lessons in their Breviary and Missal, which are read in their Churches in Time of Divine Service for authentick Holy-Scripture.

Binius indeed does sometimes omit Part of this Book in his Notes; but then it is such as no Way relates either to the Doctrine or Discipline of the Church of *Rome:* For whatever he meets with advantageous to it, tho' the grossest Fiction, he most affectionately espouses, and from thence with the most zealous Bigotry endeavours to defend their upstart Faith and new-fashioned Principles.

But since *Baronius* and other Church-Historians found their vain Conjectures upon these Lives of the Popes, it will be necessary to examine the Errors they have led many into. We will begin at St. *Peter*;

Who, although he is sufficiently proved by *Ignatius, Dionysius Corinthius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, &c.* to have been some Time at *Rome,* (See Bishop *Pearson's Dissert.* 1. *c.* 7. *p.* 32.) yet they who affirm that this Apostle, whilst he lived, named three Bishops his Successors, *viz. Linus, Cletus* and *Clement*, must excuse my Belief, as much as in that Story of his being buryed in Three several Places, *viz.* in the Temple of *Apollo*, near the *Aurelian* Way; by *Nero's* Palace in the Vatican Mount, and in the triumphal Territory. *Crab. T.* 1. *p.* 30. But the aforesaid Bishop *Pearson*, in *Dissert.* 2. *c.* 1, and 2. hath made this clear from S. *Irenæus*, who saith, *That the Blessed Apostles laying the Foundation of the Church, gave the Administration of it to* Linus. Which can be look'd upon no otherwise than a Deputation from the Apostles to *Linus* in their Absence,

 and

and this S. *Epiphanius*, in his XX. *Hæres.* gives a Reason for. —Ἐπισκόπους ἄλλους καθίσασθαι, διὰ τὸ τοὺς Ἀποστόλους πολλάκις ἐπὶ τὰς ἄλλας πατείδας τὴν πορείαν ἔλλεσθαι διὰ τὸ κήρυγμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μὴ δύνασθαι δὲ τὴν Ρωμαίων πόλιν ἄνευ Ἐπισκόπου εἶναι.— *So might other Bishops be chosen, because the Apostles being gone into other Provinces to preach the Gospel of Christ,* Rome *could not be left without a Bishop.* But this Point having been already discuss'd by several learned Pens, I shall leave it, only observing, that it is not worth the Romanists while to lay so great a Stress upon it, since it can no Way be made out, who was the immediate Successor of the Apostles in the See of *Rome.*

The Decretal Epistles of the Popes, (which are for the most Part Forgeries, especially for the first Seven Centuries) and the false and suppositi-tious Canons of the Councils, imposed on the World by the Editors, are the main Weapons with which these Champions defend their Supremacy and many other Doctrines. Some of these Epistles have been detected by Dr. *James*, in his *Treatise of the Corruptions of the Scriptures, Councils, Fathers*, &c. Likewise *Cook*, in his *Censura Scriptorum Veterum*, &c hath discovered many impious Frauds in them. And Dr. *Comber* hath in general invalidated their Credit by undeniable Arguments, as far as the first Five Centuries. With the Help of these therefore, and others well skill'd in Sacred Antiquity, we will enquire into the Lives of those Bishops of *Rome* upon whom we find these Decretal Epistles forged; and since they claim the Right of appointing and nominating Councils, shew the Reader what suppofititious Councils and Canons they have palm'd upon those and succeeding Ages to enforce their false Doctrines.

The

The first Forgery of a Council is laid so high as the Apostles Time at *Antioch*, and in Defence of Image-Worship, not introduced into the Western Church till Seven Centuries after. This Council, according to *Turrian* the Jesuit, depends upon the single Testimony of *Pamphilus Martyr*, who says there was a Synod of the Apostles held at *Antioch* about some Controversies, in which Synod there were Nine Canons made, which were afterwards found in *Origen*'s Library. The Ninth Canon *gives Leave to make an Image of our Saviour, and of his Servants.* This Canon *Fran. Longus a Corialano* (a great and confident Parasite of the Court of *Rome*, hugs with infinite Pleasure, and boldly asserts *the antient Use of Images from it, in Opposition to the Hereticks of all Ages.* This is so gross an Imposture, that *Labee* touches it very lightly, expressing only one Canon, but lets *Binius* loose, who never fails to defend any, tho' the most improbable Fiction, if it favour any of their unreasonable Doctrines. 'Tis certain this Forgery was never heard of before that infamous Second Council of *Nice*, for neither *Eusebius*, *Socrates*, *Theodoret*, *Ruffinus*, or any of the antient Writers, make Mention of it. But this *Nicene* Council wanted Authority to prove the Doctrine of Image-Worship, and therefore they trump'd up this sham Council to confirm it. I shall next go on with the Decretal Epistles, the first of which is next in Order, intending to take both according to their Date, whether true or pretended.

The Decretal Epistles are very often quoted by the Romanists in the Controversies between them and us, but especially in the Point of Supremacy; for which Reason they all cry them up. But none in their Eulogies come up to *Alphonsus de Castro* and *Gratian*; the first giving them an Equality with the Canons of the Councils, the second ranking them

with the Canonical Holy Scriptures. No Wonder then that these Forgeries have gained such Ground as to be incorporated with the Body of the Canon Law in all Countries where the Church of *Rome* prevails.

[*A. D.* 91.] The first Parcel in this Bundle of Forgeries are Five Epistles inscrib'd to Pope *Clement*, the first of which is quoted by *Hosius* for *Auricular Confession*, and by *Bellarmine* in Defence of the Supremacy, *&c.* *Confess. Petri, c.* 47. *De Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14.

Now, that this Epistle is adulterate, there are many Arguments to prove. First, it is said in it, that when S. *Peter* ordained *Clement* his Successor, he thus speak to the Congregation: *Observe, Brethren, that I ordain this* Clement *to be your Bishop, and to whom only I deliver my Power of Preaching and Doctrine.* And when *Clement* threw himself at S. *Peter's* Feet, and in Modesty declined the Honour of the Chair, S. *Peter* resolutely persisted. But how can this be, when all, both antient and modern Writers do agree, that *Linus* and *Cletus* were before *Clement.* S. *August. Ep.* 165. *Irenæus adv. Hæres. l.* 3. *c.* 5. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l.* 3. *c.* 2. *&c.* This Reason hath so prevailed with several *Romanists*, that they questioned the Truth of this Epistle. Thus *Sixtus Senensis, Bibl. l.* 2. *Clemens. This Epistle may be questioned, for it is very absurd that* Clement *should be said to succeed S.* Peter, *since it is plain that* Linus *and* Cletus *were Bishops before him.* And Cardinal *Cusanus*, in his *Concord. Cath l.* 3. very bluntly declares, *That their Inconsistencies betray them.*

Secondly, There is another Passage in it which likewise betrays it, and that is of S. *Peter*, speaking thus to *Clement*, *I beseech thee*, O Clement, *before all that are here present, that after I shall have paid the last*

Debt

Debt to Nature, thou write to James *our Brother, &c.* This likewise is too gross to pass upon any that consider; S. *James* died Seven Years before S. *Peter*, as appears from *Josephus* and *Eusebius*. Certainly he must be a very blind Bigot, that can believe S. *Peter* should advise *Clement* to write to a dead Man, or that *Clement* should be so crack-brained as to write a tedious, ridiculous Letter to a Person whom he knew to be dead. This barefac'd Imposture so stumbled *Peter Comestor, in Hist. Schol. in Act. Apost. c.* 10. *that he rejects it as spurious, positively affirming, there can be nothing in it, of* Clement's *Writing to St.* James *after St.* Peter's *Death, that he might be instructed by him, since it is certain that St.* James *died in the Seventh, and St.* Peter *in the Fourtenth Year of* Nero. The same Reason likewise moved Cardinal *de Turrecremata* to reject this Epistle as forged and fabulous, as the aforesaid *Sixtus Sen.* well observes in *Summa de Eccl. l.* 2. *c.* 101.

Thirdly, in this Epistle the Word *Primatus*, or Supremacy, is mentioned, which Word was not in Use in that Age, nor in many after.

The Second Epistle of *Clement* may well be suspected by the Title, which at once blows it up. Clement, *Bishop of the* Roman *Church, to* James *Bishop of* Jerusalem. But St. *James*, as has been already hinted, died before St. *Peter*, and, consequently, before *Clement* was made a Bishop. Besides, this Epistle is stuffed with Trifles, which nevertheless are urged with as much Vehemence as if the Well-Being of the Church depended on them. He admonishes St. *James*, (who by the Way, stood not, I believe, in Need of his Advice) how the Holy Vessels should be used, tells him, *That the Altar-Pall, Chair, Candlestick and Veil, when grown old and decay'd, should be burn'd, &c.* Can any Man be so void of Sense, as to think St. *Peter* should be

ſollicitous about Things of ſo little Moment; or that St. *James*, the Brother of our Lord, and Collegue with St. *Peter* in the Apoſtleſhip, wanted his Directions in them?

The Third Epiſtle of *Clement* is of the ſame Piece with the Second, and a moſt inauſpicious Blunder of one Word diſcovers the Cheat; *viz. A Presbyter ſhall not ſay Maſs in his* Pariſh *without Leave from his own Biſhop.* Now, that *Clement* could not be the Author of this Epiſtle, and that it was not written till many Years after, plainly appears from *Baronius*, who tells us, *Clement* died in the Year 102. But Pariſhes were not conſtituted nor divided till the Year 261, in which Year Pope *Dionyſius* is ſaid to be alive. And he it was, according to *Polydore Virgil*, who firſt divided the People into *Pariſhes*, *De Invent. Rerum, l.* 4. *c.* 9. But the Truth on't is, this Epiſtle was forged for divers Ends, being quoted by ſeveral *Romaniſts* to juſtify the modern Rites of their Church.

Bellarmine, ſpeaking of the Fourth Epiſtle of *Clement*, confeſſes it is doubtful whoſe it is. And if we conſider one Paſſage in it, it would be very unjuſt to father it upon *Clement*. The Paſſage is this: *It is good, and agreeable to Purity, to waſh the Body with Water, for where that outward Purification of the Fleſh is neglected, the Purity of the Mind, and Cleanneſs of the Heart is not obſerved, &c.* Theſe Words would better become one of thoſe Phariſees in the Scriptures, who are ſaid to waſh often, than ſo Apoſtolick a Man as *Clement*. And *Bovius*, in his Preface to the *Clementine Conſtitutions*, making Mention of theſe Epiſtles, ſaith, *There are many Things in them taken from the* Itinerarium, *(another Forgery, and father'd upon* Clement*) which leſſens the Credit of them very much. In one of which, about the frequent Waſhing the Body, there is ſomething not to be born. For the* Ebionites,

who

who practise daily Baptism, by these Corruptions of Clement, *make St.* Peter *the Author of their Baptisms.*

The Fifth Epistle of *Clement* is like the rest, for in the Beginning of it *Clement* is said *to write to the Brethren dwelling at* Jerusalem *with St.* James; which could not be, for (as has been before observ'd) St. *James* died Seven Years before St. *Peter*, and *Clement* was not Bishop of *Rome* till after St. *Peter*, as appears by St. *Jerome de Viris Illust.* and other Writers of Ecclesiastick Affairs.

[104.] The Second Century begins with the Papacy of *Anacletus.* This Pope, by *Binius*, is said to have done several notable Feats, but names not one. However, according to Custom, he must write Epistles, and Three are by the Editors laid to his Charge. The first of which is as ridiculous as false, for it is quoted by *Perefius de Trad. par.* 3. *p.* 89. and other Champions of the Pontificate, to prove *Clement*'s first Epistle to *James* the Brother of our Lord to be genuine: By *Pighius*, *in Hierarch. lib.* 6. *c.* 6. and *Stapleton*, in his *Relect. Contro.* 3. *q.* 7. *Conclus.* 1. to prove, *That all the World ought to appeal to the* Roman *Pontiff.* And for that Reason it is, that *Perefius* so much extolls this Epistle, and contrary to all Reason and Probability affirms, *This Epistle was written by* Anacletus, *who had seen St.* Peter, *and was ordained Presbyter by him*, &c. But to prove this Epistle spurious, we will only consider;

☞ Note, *That the Author observes the Chronology of the Editors in the Series of Time, chiefly that of* Cabbasutius, *(though he knows it false) the better to lead the Reader into the Discovery of their Forgeries and Errors.*

1. That

1. That many Passages about comparing the Church to a Ship, are taken *verbatim* out of *Clement*'s First Epistle; by which this must be spurious, because *Clement* succeeded *Anacletus* Twelve Years after, and by the Title of the Epistles, cannot be said to have written them before *Anacletus*'s Death.

2. There is another Passage which demonstrates this Epistle to be spurious. The Author of it calls *Clement* the Antecessor or Predecessor of *Anaclete*. Which is quite contrary to the Opinion of the Ancient Fathers, who make *Anaclete* the Predecessor to *Clement*: Particularly *Irenæus*, *l.* 3. *c.* 3. *adverſ. Hæreſ.* in expreſs Words: *Fundantes igitur & inſtruentes beati Apoſtoli Eccleſiam, Lino Epiſcopatum adminiſtrandæ Eccleſiæ tradiderunt. Hujus Lini Paulus, in his quæ ad Timotheum Epiſtolis ſunt, meminit.* 2 Tim. 4. 21. *Succedit autem ei Anacletus, & poſt eum tertio loco Apoſtolis Epiſcopatum ſortitur Clemens. The Apoſtles laying the Foundation of the Church, gave the Adminiſtration of it to* Linus; *which* Linus *St.* Paul *mentions in* 2 Tim. 4. 21. *To this* Linus *ſucceeded* Anaclete, *and after him* Clement *was the Third Biſhop.*

The Second Epiſtle attributed to *Anaclete* is of the ſame Leaven with the Firſt; for, beſides the Blunder about *Anaclete*'s Succeſſion, (which is likewiſe here mention'd) the Author of it tells us, That the 70 Diſciples mentioned in St. *Luke* 10. were choſen by the Apoſtles, and not by our Lord.

The Third Epiſtle is quoted by *Bellarmine*, *de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 11, & 14. to prove that St. *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome* to the Time of his Death; and that the Pope of *Rome* is St. *Peter*'s Succeſſor in the Monarchy of the Church. This they attempt by a barbarous Derivation of the Word *Cephas*, (which in Syriac ſignifies a Stone) from the Greek Word Κεφαλὴ, *Caput*, and from thence juſtify their imaginary Supremacy.

[110] Pope

[110.] Pope *Euaristus* is the next; of whom, notwithstanding what the Editors say, little can be prov'd; for at that Time the Bishops of *Rome* made but a mean Figure in the World, and scarce any Thing but their Names are to be found upon Authentick Record. However, according to Custom, he must father Two Epistles, though they are apparently fictitious, as *Contius* proves in his Preface, *c.* 30. *q.* 5.

[119.] *Alexander* ascends the Papal Throne next; about whom the *Roman Breviary*, *Liber Pontificalis*, *Binius*, *Labbe*, *&c.* make a fearful Squabble, all differing about the Time of his Accession to the Papacy. They likewise talk of very great Things of his doing; but nothing is prov'd: Nay, the Persons said to be converted by him were not at that Time in Being. I am very willing to believe, That the Bishops of *Rome* in these early Days were Men plentifully stor'd and adorn'd with Learning, Piety, and all Christian Virtues, and therefore cannot easily be induced to entertain a Belief of the abominable Impostures father'd on them: Nay, some so impious, as to transpose the very Words of the Holy Scripture, and apply them basely to countenance some whimsical Rite or ridiculous Ceremony. A Taste of which let the Reader take from the First Epistle of this Pope, which I take to be one of the grossest Abuses of its Kind. This Epistle, you must know, was invented to confirm certain modern Rites, which the Editors would have the World believe were very ancient: And therefore *Bellarmine*, *de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14. quotes it to defend the Papal Supremacy, and to prove, That Water mix'd with Salt is powerful toward the purging away of Sins. *De Cultu Sanct. l.* 3. *c.* 7. This is done by a most violent as well as impious Distortion of the Holy Scripture: For

whereas

whereas St. *Paul*, in *Heb.* 9. 13, 14. says, *If the Blood of Bulls and Goats, and the Ashes of an Heifer sprinkling them that are unclean, sanctifieth, as touching the Purifying of the Flesh; How much more shall the Blood of Christ*, &c. *purge your Conscience from dead Works?* These are the Words of the Text. But in this Epistle of Pope *Alexander*, instead of the Words, *How much more shall the Blood of Christ?* they profanely foist in, *How much more shall Water mix'd with Salt, and consecrated by our Prayers, sanctify and cleanse the People?*

The Author of this Epistle is guilty of another great Oversight; for in it he is very prolix about the *Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity*, professing he received such Doctrines from the Fathers of the Church. But the Word *Trinity*, and the Doctrine of it, was not delivered till after the Second Century; whereas it is most certain, that Pope *Alexander* lived about the Year 120.

The Date of this Epistle likewise betrays it: But that is a Fault incidental to most of the decretal Epistles, and therefore I shall not insist on it here.

The Second Epistle of this Pope is discoverable by a ridiculous Exposition of *Hosea* 4. 8. *They eat up the Sins of my People*; which, if compar'd with the Context, plainly shews, That by *Eating up the Sins of the People*, is there meant the Priests conniving at and encouraging the People in their Sins. But this awkward Expositor will have *Eating up the Sins of the People*, to imply *the Dignity of Priests, who by their Prayers and Offerings eat up the Sins of the People.* He will not find St. *Jerome* of his Side in this Exposition.

The Third Epistle shews it self by its false Latin: *Cavete vos Fratres, &c.* Besides the false Date of Consuls, of which the Second is likewise guilty. But *Azorius* the Jesuit gives them their due

Chara-

Character; for he plainly ſays, *That the Epiſtles of Pope* Alexander I. *are very queſtionable as to their Authority.* Coc. p. 30.

[130.] The *Pontifical* will have Pope *Xiſtus*, or *Sixtus*, to die a Martyr; though it's no where elſe mentioned: And to enlarge his Figure a little more, a Couple of Epiſtles are aſcribed to him. The Firſt of which *Bellarmine* makes Uſe of to prove the Book of *Baruch* to be Canonical Scripture, and is dated under the Conſulſhip of *Adrian* and *Verus*, who were not Conſuls in *Sixtus*'s Pontificate. *Gratian* quotes the Second Epiſtle, in Defence of *Appeals to the Patriarch of* Rome: And *Baronius* and *Bellarmine* from thence will have *Sixtus* call'd *Biſhop of the Univerſal Church.* This bears the ſame Date with the other, and conſequently is of equal Credit.

[140.] The next Pope is *Teleſphorus*, who makes but a poor Appearance in the *Pontifical*, having but one Epiſtle aſcrib'd to him, which is cited by *Durant, de Rit. Eccleſ. Cath. l. 2. c. 1. n. 6.* to prove that the Word *Maſs* was very ancient among the Latins. This Epiſtle is one of them which *Azorius* confeſſes wants Authority: However, to make up what is wanting in the Pontifical, the Notes lay it on at once, by telling us, *That this Pope ordain'd Thirteen Biſhops, who were to go into all Parts of the World.* From whence they infer, *That the Biſhop of* Rome *was not only to take Care of* Rome, *but of the whole World.*

[152.] *Hyginus* is as obſcure as his Predeceſſor; and therefore, to ſet him off the better, the *Pontifical* makes him to do what *Clement* had been ſaid to do before him, which was to diſtribute the Orders among the Clergy; and to make him a little more faſhionable, allow him to have written Two Epiſtles; but ruin the Credit of them by dating them

them in the Consulship of *Magnus* and *Camerinus*; though there was no such Person as *Magnus* mention'd in or near those Times.

[156.] The Editors cannot agree about *Pius* and *Anicetus*, whether was first; which plainly proves what little Care was taken about their Succession, and consequently how uncertain it must be: However, we'll follow their own Account, and take Pope *Pius* next; whose Epistles are cited by *Bellarmine*, to prove the Papal Supremacy, *De Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14. And yet, with incomparable Assurance, says, *He dare not affirm these Epistles to be of undoubted Authority.* How ridiculous then is it to quote a Forgery in Vindication of so darling a Topick as the Supremacy? And truly, we cannot but think *Baronius* affected with the same Stupidity, when we find him, in his Annals, *T.* 2. *ad An.* 167. *n.* 3. vindicating by these Forgeries what he might have justified by many ancient and authentick Canons of both Greek and Latin Churches; *viz. That what was once given to Divine Uses should not be profan'd by humane Service.* Sacrilege was always so abominable a Sin, that the most early Times took Care to restrain and prevent it; and therefore they need not have had Recourse to Fictions to defend the Church against it. It would have look'd honest in both, if they had ingenuously told the World, that these Epistles were supposititious; which they might safely have done, for *Baronius* (whose Skill in Chronology was too great to make such a Blunder) very well knew, That *Clarus* and *Severus*, under whose Consulship these Epistles are dated, were never Consuls together.

[165.] *Anicetus*'s Epistle about shaving his Priests Crowns is suspected by *Bellarmine*, because, *perhaps* (says he) *it bears a false Title*; which appears in the End of the Epistle; for it is dated in the Consul-

Consulship of *Gallicanus* and *Rufinus*, whom we do not find either in *Baronius*, or any other eminent Writer, to have been Consuls at the same Time: And yet this Epistle, groundless and false as it is, must pass for genuine Testimony in Behalf of the *Supremacy*. *Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14.

[173.] The Second Epistle of *Soter* is cited by *Durant, de Rit. Eccl. Cath. l.* 1. *c.* 9. to prove the *Romish Thurification*, or Offering of Incense, to be a Primitive Institution: But this is likewise discovered by the Date; for there were no such Men as *Cethegus* and *Clarus* Consuls in the Time of *Soter*. But there is one Oversight in the Lives of these Popes, *Anicetus* and *Soter*. The Pontifical tells us they were both buried in the Burial-Place of Pope *Calistus*; but it is certain, that *Calistus*, who gave this Burial-Place, died above Fifty Years after *Anicetus*. But *Binius*, to colour this, says, *You must understand it in that Place where* Calistus *afterwards built a Cœmitery*. But this cannot make it out, for *Soter*, *Anicetus*'s Successor, was buried there likewise.

[177.] There is no better Authority for the Epistle of *Lucius*, King of *Britain*, to *Eleutherius*, and *Eleutherius*'s Answer, than the *Pontifical*: Which will not do; for from that very Fragment (*c.*30. *q.*5. *judicantem*) it is plain, *That they were the Words of the Emperor* Constantine *to* Theodosianus *above an Hundred Years after* Eleutherius's *Time, and which the Forger of this Epistle, concealing the Name, patch'd up*. Contius, c. 30. q. 5.

Vid. Collier's *Ch. Hist. T.* 1. *p.* 15. *&c.*

[192.] Thundering Pope *Victor*'s boisterous Treatment of the Eastern Bishops made no small Noise in those Times; of which, *Eusebius, l.* 5. *c.* 23, 24, *&c.* speaks at large. This Pope's First Epistle is quoted by *Bellarmine, de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14.

to prove the Supremacy; *and that the Popes of* Rome *were call'd Bishops of the Universal Church.* But the Authority of this Epistle is like that of the rest; for it is dated in the Consulship of *Commodus* and *Gratian*; though, according to *Baronius*, there were no such Consuls during the Papacy of *Victor.*

The Second Epistle of this Pope is quoted by *Lindanus*, to prove, *That all Bishops ought to appeal to the Bishop of* Rome. But this Epistle discovers it self, as well as that of *Eleutherius*, to have been written by some ignorant Monk, by beginning with the Word *Enim*, and the false Latin in it; *Perlatum est ad Sedem Apostolicam, aliquos* NOCERE FRATRES *velle*: Which the Editors of all Things ought to take Care of, and not to charge the Infallible Universal Bishop with.

[201.] *Zepherine*'s Two Epistles are of no better Credit than any of the former, bearing Date under Consuls whom *Marian* about these Times does not mention.

[219.] The *Pontifical* and the *Notes* tell many ridiculous Fables concerning *Calixtus*; which the latter would seem to correct by a more ridiculous Author, *viz.* the Roman Martyrology: All indeed of like Credit. The First Epistle of this Pope is cited by *Bellarmine, de Pon. Oper. c.* 19. *& in Lib.* 2. *de Rom. Pont.* for the Pope's Supremacy, and to prove the Book of *Tobias* to be *canonical.* The Second Epistle of *Calixtus* appropriates to *the See of* Rome *alone the Power of translating of Bishops from one City to another.* This Arrogance of the *Roman Pontifs* was so far from being allowed by the Greek Church, that the First *Nicene* Council, *Can.* 15, 16. and the Council of *Carthago*, *A. D.* 419. *Can.* 52. positively forbid the Thing. But whatever End these Epistles were made to answer, 'tis certain their Authority is very questionable: For though

Bellarmine confidently quotes them both as Authentick Testimonies, in Defence of what he there urges, yet he tells us he dare not affirm these Epistles to be genuine, *de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 14.* To what End then does he quote what he dare not stand by? But all People are not so curious as to enquire into the Truth of these Authorities, but take all for granted that these faithless Oracles vent. But *Antonius Augustinus* tells the plain Truth of the Matter, *viz. That the Persons who were employed at* Rome *to correct* Gratian, *rejected the Epistles of* Calixtus. De Emend. Gratian. l. 2. dial. 4.

[224.] There are several idle and groundless Stories in the Life of Pope *Urban* in the *Pontifical*; none of which are more trifling and frivolous than an Epistle father'd on him, and quoted by *Bellarmine, de Confirm. l. 2. c. 3.* to prove *Confirmation to be a Sacrament.* And yet this very *Bellarmine*, speaking of the Epistles of *Clement, Melchiades, Eusebius*, and this *Urban*, owns, *That it is not certain whether they were the Authors of them whose Names they bear*: Which is pretty plain by this Epistle, for it is dated in the Consulship of *Antoninus* and *Alexander*, who, if we may believe *Baronius*, were never Consuls during the Pontificate of *Urban*.

[231.] The many Barbarisms in the Epistle ascribed to *Pontianus* plainly shew it to be a Counterfeit. This Epistle may probably give Occasion to that idle Fable of St. *Peter*'s being *Porter of Heaven*; for the Author of it exciting People to several Christian Duties, *promises them the Reward of Eternal Glory by Jesus Christ, and that St.* Peter *should open to them the Gate of Glory.* These are meer Dreams of old Women, to make St. *Peter* Porter of Heaven, as if the Gates of it were not equally committed to all Pastors of the Church with St. *Peter*.

[235.] *Anterus*'s Epiſtle is one of the moſt ſcandalous Impoſtures that can be invented; for in it there is Mention made of one *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* at that Time or thereabout: But there was no ſuch Man as *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* in or near theſe Times: For *Nicephorus* (*Bibl. vet. Patr. Tom.* 7. *Edit.* 3.) reckoning up the Biſhops of *Alexandria* to *Peter*, who was the Fifty ſecond, and preſided over that Church to the Year 640, makes no Mention of *Euſebius*. This Epiſtle, notwithſtanding it is ſo notorious a Forgery, is quoted by *Stapleton* againſt *Horn* Biſhop of *Winchester*, *l.* 4. *fol.* 468. in Favour of the Supremacy. By *Vermierus*, to prove the Real Preſence, *fol.* 15. By *Turrian*, *pro Epiſt. Pont. l.* 4. *c.* 14. to prove the Propagation of the Faith out of certain ſpurious Things which paſs under the ſham Name of *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, *&c.*

[236.] Pope *Fabian* is ſaid to have written Three Epiſtles, and which for notorious Falſhood come not ſhort of any that go before: For in the Firſt it is affirmed, That *Novatus* and *certain other Confeſſors, were come from* Afric *in the Time of* Fabian, *and had departed from the Church of Chriſt*, &c. Now it is plain from *Euſebius*, and all others, (according to *Baronius*, *An.* 238. *n.* 9, 10.) That this muſt be in the Papacy of *Cornelius*: Nay, *Baronius* himſelf at laſt is forced to call this Epiſtle ſpurious.

After *Bellarmine*, *de Verb. Dei*, *l.* 1. *c.* 6. had quoted the Second Epiſtle of this Pope, to prove ſeveral Traditions, and that the Materials of Confirmation were *Oil* and *Balſam*, *de Confirm. c.* 8. in the very ſame Place he queſtions the Credit of this Epiſtle. But the greateſt Fraud is in the Third Epiſtle which from one End to the other is taken out of the Decrees of Pope *Sixtus* III; as *Peter Crabb* very honeſtly obſerves in the Margin of this

Epiſtle,

Epiſtle, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 118. *col.* 2. which Pope *Sixtus* III. lived about 200 Years after *Fabian*. Happy Wits, to jump together from ſo great a Diſtance! The Date of this Epiſtle is likewiſe falſe, for *Africanus* and *Decius* were not Conſuls whilſt *Fabian* was Pope, as appears from *Baronius*.

In this Pope's Time there were Two Councils held, one at *Lambeſe* in *Africa*, againſt *Privatus* the *Heretick*, and the other at *Boſtra* in *Arabia*, in the Cauſe of *Beryllus*, Biſhop thereof. Theſe Two Councils the Editors will have entitled under *Fabian*; though the Two only Writers that mention them, *viz.* St. *Cyprian*, *Epiſt.* 55. *ad Cornel.* and *Euſebius*, *l.* 6. *c.* 33. take no Notice of *Fabian* in either of them; from whence we may very fairly conclude he had no Concern there: For about that Time there was a great Intimacy between the Church at *Rome* and at *Carthage*, often adviſing and aſſiſting one another, but aſſuming no Power to judge or cenſure each other, but in a Synodical Way.

[251.] *Cornelius*'s Epiſtles are quoted to prove many new and unheard of Doctrines in the Primitive Church. The Firſt is cited by *Bellarmine*, and many others, to prove the *Invocation of Saints*, *Tranſlation of Relicks*, &c. *Bellarm. de Sanct. Beat. l.* 2. *c.* 19. *de Imag. l.* 2. *c.* 3. But this Epiſtle is ſpurious; which appears from that idle Fable of the Tranſlation of the Bodies of SS. *Peter* and *Paul*, which is mention'd in this Epiſtle; but was impoſſible to be done in the Time of a raging Perſecution. Beſides, the Date of it is falſe, for *Decius* and *Maximus* were not Conſuls in the *Pontificate* of *Cornelius*, according to *Baronius*.

The Second Epiſtle is quoted by *Ivo*, in *Decret. l.* 4. *to prove, that Clergymen ought to appeal no where*

but to the See of Rome; and by *Gratian* for several other Causes: But if any one will take the Pains to compare this and the foregoing with the genuine Epistles of *Cornelius*, which are extant in St. *Cyprian* and *Eusebius*, he will find so great a Disparity both in Style and Matter, as must condemn them as spurious and adulterate.

Whatsoever Councils were held during this Pope's Time, whether in *Africa* or *Italy*, they are by the Editors entitled under him, as if call'd by his Authority: But if we look into St. *Cyprian*'s, 43, 45, 55, 59 *Epist. Edit. Ox.* we shall find the *Carthaginian* Councils at that Time call'd by St. *Cyprian*'s Authority alone; and the Decrees of the Second Council of *Carthage*, (which was the First of St. *Cyprian*) about receiving the *Lapsed* again into Communion, were not authoritatively confirm'd by the First Council of *Rome* under *Cornelius*, but approv'd and consented unto by that Council; which is very clear from the Words of St. *Cyprian*, in his 55 *Epist. ad Anton.* Cornelius *himself, and several of his Brethren the Bishops, consented with us in the same Decree*, &c.

[253.] The Editors are at a great Loss about Pope *Lucius*, differing very much in their Accounts of his Death. However, according to Custom, he must Leave an Epistle behind him, which is to serve some great Ends. This Epistle is quoted by *Bellarmine, de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14. to prove *the Bishop of* Rome *St.* Peter's *Successor in the Ecclesiastick Monarchy*; and in *l.* 3. *c.* 5. *de Verb. Dei, That the said Bishop teaching from the Chair, cannot err.* Again, *de Rom. Pont. l.* 4. *c.* 3. *That there never could be found any in the Chair of St.* Peter, *that taught contrary to the Faith.* But for this Infallibility, I refer the Reader to *Marcellinus* and *Liberius*, (not to name others) who often laps'd and return'd, according to their own

own Accounts. But notwithstanding the great Topicks which Cardinal *Bellarmine* pretends to prove from this Epistle, in the aforesaid *l.* 2. *c.* 14. *This Epistle is one of those which he owns he dare not affirm for authentick*; and no Wonder, since it is dated under the Consulship of *Gallus* and *Volusian*, who were not Consuls in the Time of *Lucius*, according to *Baronius*.

[255.] We come next to that troublesome Pope *Stephen*, who gave *Cyprian* and the *African* Bishops much Disturbance about the *rebaptizing Hereticks*: Which Controversy makes it plainly appear how inconsiderable the Authority of the Bishop of *Rome* was beyond his own District. The Editors indeed, after their usual Manner, and without a Scruple, intitle all Councils, wheresoever held, or by whomsoever call'd, under their own Bishop; though, as in this Case, between the *African* Bishops and the Bishop of *Rome*, several Councils were call'd without the Bishop of *Rome*'s Knowledge, and which condemn'd even his Opinion: But nothing more than *Cyprian*'s Behaviour to Pope *Stephen* shews that at that Time (and I know no Reason why not all his Successors afterwards) the Bishop of *Carthage*, and other *African* Bishops, allowed the Bishop of *Rome* no Superiority over them. St. *Cyprian* in his Epistle to Pope *Stephen*, (which is the 67th in the *Antwerp* Edit.) after he had used several Arguments and Admonitions to perswade *Stephen* to join with him and the rest of the *African* Bishops in receiving the *Lapsi'd*, lets him know, that they had a Share with him in the Care and Government of the Church, *Nam etsi Pastores multi sumus, unum tamen gregem pascimus, &c. For though we are many Pastors, yet we have but one Flock; and we ought to gather together and cherish all those Sheep which Christ purchased with his Blood.* And if we

 consider

consider the whole Purport of this Epistle, we shall plainly find this Infallible Judge in Danger of lapsing, or at least of favouring Hereticks. For *Cyprian*, to rowse him, tells him, *Servandus est antecessorum nostrorum beatorum Martyrum Cornelii & Lucii Honor gloriosus, &c. We must keep up the Honour of our Ancestors, those blessed Martyrs* Cornelius *and* Lucius, *whose Memory ought to be honoured by us, but much more by you, most dear Brother, who are become their Vicar and Successor.* But at the End of his 72d Epistle, to this same Pope *Stephen*, he gives a final Conclusion about the so much affected Supremacy in the Bishop of *Rome*. *Nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, aut legem damus, cùm, &c. Nor do we compel any by Force or Law, for every Bishop has free Liberty of exercising Jurisdiction in his own Diocess or Church.* *Firmilianus*, Bishop of *Cesarea*, wrote a long and bitter Epistle to St. *Cyprian*, sharply inveighing against the Arrogancy of the Bishop of *Rome* in several Things, *Ep.* 75. *Antwerp. Edit. p.* 196. All which shew, that there was little Regard had to the Bishop of *Rome* when he assumed what did not of Right belong to him. And the foresaid *Firmilianus* called the Council of *Iconium*, which decreed in Opposition to the Bishop of *Rome*. As did the Council of *Synnada*, and several *African* Councils; but especially the Eighth *Carthaginian* (which is the Seventh of St. *Cyprian*). For when Pope *Stephen* would not acquiesce and consent to the Decrees of former Synods, but talked big, and threat'ning; St. *Cyprian*, to shew how little he valued his Menaces, resolved to put an End to the Controversy in a full Synod, where, besides Priests and Deacons, and a great Number of Lay-men, there were present 87 Bishops, who unanimously sign'd the Decree for *Rebaptizing Hereticks*, which the *Universal Bishop*, with

with all his pretended Authority, could neither prevent nor contradict.

[257.] Neither the Editors nor the Notes can agree about Pope *Sixtus* the Second, both mistaking the Person, and the Time of his Death. Which ridiculous Squabble the Notes labour, but in vain, to reconcile. However a Pope they must have, and he must be called *Sixtus* the Second, whom the *Pontifical* blunderingly mistakes for *Sixtus* the Philosopher. [Excellent Authority indeed for Sacred Antiquity!] And to make him the more fashionable, he must have an Epistle tack'd to his Life, which Epistle is cited by *Lindanus* to prove, *That all Appeals ought to be made to the Bishop of* Rome. *Panopl. l. 4. c.* 89. But this Epistle has the Misfortune of the former, for it is dated under *Valerian* and *Decius*; tho' it is plain that no Annals from *Brute* to *Justinian*, (in whose Time the Office of Consuls was laid aside) can produce such Persons for Consuls.

[258.] The Editors likewise are at a great Loss about Pope *Dionisius*, differing very much in the Names and Times of the Consuls during this Papacy. But to make him look somewhat considerable, and to keep up the old Story of the *Supremacy*, they publish a sham Council at *Rome* under this Pope, and pretend, (to shew the Bishop of *Rome*'s Power) that *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, for certain Misdemeanors, was cited thither to clear himself, which he, say they, so far obey'd as by Letter to clear himself. And to justify this, no less than the Testimony of *Athanasius* will serve, and which with their usual Assurance they quote. But it is most certain, that *Athanasius* says nothing of this *Roman* Council, or the Citation of *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*; only that this *Dionysius*, hearing he

was accused, wrote an Apology to vindicate himself.

The Two Councils of *Antioch*, which were called in the Case of *Paulus Samosatenus*, were called without the Knowledge of Pope *Dionysius*; which is plain from *Eusebius*, *l. 7. c. 22.* who does not so much as mention the Pope. And considering the grand Appearance of so many eminent Men in the Church at that Time, such as *Gregory Thaumaturg*, Bishop of *Neocesarea*, his Brother *Athenodorus*, *Helenos* of *Tarsus*, *Nicomas* of *Iconium*, *Hymeneus* of *Jerusalem*, *Theotheenus* of *Cesarea* in *Palestine*, *Firmilianus* of *Cesarea* in *Cappadocia*, and *Maximus* of *Bostre*; all or most of which made a much more considerable Figure in the Church at that Time than the Bishop of *Rome*, it is not to be wonder'd at that he should not be taken Notice of. Besides, as *Firmilianus* was President of this Council, who had so roughly treated Pope *Stephen*, calling him *Judas*, *Schismatick*, *a Favourer of Hereticks*, *Enemy to the Church*, *insolent*, *inhumane*, &c. it is very improbable he should submit to allow the Bishop of *Rome* a Supremacy, either in calling or managing these Councils. See *Firmil. Epistle to St. Cyprian.* But it is plain from *Eusebius*, *l. 7. c. 30.* that Pope *Dionysius* knew nothing of these Councils, but from the Synodical Epistle which was sent to him, to *Maximus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and other Bishops of the Catholick Church. Which plainly shews what little Share the Bishop of *Rome* had in these Councils, and how unjustly the Editors palm an Universal Monarchy in the Church upon those who did not so much as claim it.

[270.] After the Editors have made a great Bustle to prove Pope *Felix* I. a Martyr, they barbarously misquote St. *Cyprian* to justify their offering the Sacrifice of the Mass for the Dead. But

St. Cy-

St. *Cyprian*'s Words in *l.* 3. *Ep.* 6. *Dies eorum quibus excedunt*, &c. shew the Cheat. *Observe the Days*, says he, *in which they depart, that we may commemorate them among the Martyrs.* 'Tis certain by this Epistle, that St. *Cyprian* spoke this only of the Confessors who died in Prison, that they might be recogniz'd among the Martyrs, which is far from justifying their modern Practices.

There are Three Epistles attributed to this Pope, the first of which is cited by *Gratian*, to prove, *That Primates ought not to pass any Sentence upon a Bishop without the Authority of the Bishop of* Rome. The Second is likewise cited by him, to prove, *That Accusers, who cannot make out what they alledge, shall not hereafter be admitted to give their Testimony.* The Third Epistle is cited by *Bellarmine, de verb. Dei, l.* 3. *c.* 5. to prove, *That the Bishop of* Rome *in the Chair cannot err.* The First Epistle is dated under the Consulship of *Claudius* and *Aurelianus*, the Second and Third under *Claudius* and *Paterum*. But if *Baronius* may be believed, there were no such Consuls in the Time of *Felix* the First.

[275, 283.] The *Pontifical* and the Notes cannot agree about the two following Popes, *Eutychianus* and *Gaius*. I shall therefore leave them to themselves, and only take Notice of the Epistle of the latter, which is cited by *Bellarmine, de Clericis, l.* 1. *c.* 28. to prove, *That Clergymen ought not to be punished by a Lay-Judge.* But this Epistle is for the most part taken out of *Leo* I.'s Epistle to the *Palestines*, and another to *Leo* the Emperor. There is likewise a great deal of it in *Agapetus*'s Epistle to *Anthimus* Bishop of *Constantinople*, for which Reason *Baronius* reckons it spurious.

[296.] We come next to one of the great Instances of humane Weakness in the *Infallible Judge*, in the Person of Pope *Marcellinus*, the last of this

Cen-

Century, whom both the *Pontifical* and the *Notes* own to have sacrificed to Idols; but whilst *Binius* endeavours to justify him, he makes him blacker; for he says, *Tho' he denied the Faith by outward Acts, yet by his inward Acts he did not believe any Thing contrary to the Faith.* And in *page* 175. *col.* 1, 2. he says, *The ill Deeds of Bishops may hurt themselves, but cannot prejudice the Church's Orthodox Doctrine.* 'Tis granted; but I hope, that these Guides will not pretend to be infallible, after such conspicuous Failings. But how strangely do ill Habits improve! Besides the many Blunders and Inconsistencies in the Life of this Pope, to colour over all, they feign a Council near *Sinuessa*, in a severe Persecution under *Diocletian*, where Three hundred Bishops met in a Cave that could hold but Fifty, where they absurdly bring *Marcellinus* to judge and condemn himself. And tho' they say, *That by this Pope's Fall the whole Christian Religion was in Danger*, yet notwithstanding, their Universal Ecclesiastick Monarch must be infallible, and every sham Council, that does but favour any darling Topick, shall pass for genuine. This Pope must not part without an Epistle, tho' it be a most manifest Forgery. The Second Epistle of *Marcellinus* is cited by *Bellarmine*, for the same Purpose as that of Pope *Gaius*, *viz.* *That Clergymen ought not to be punished by a Lay-Judge. De Cler. l.* 1. *c.* 28. But *Baronius*, speaking of this *Marcellinus*, says, *that he remembers only one Epistle, which he wrote to one* Salomon, *a Bishop.* But the foresaid Second Epistle is patch'd up out of several Authors. The First Part of it is taken *verbatim* out of Pope *Hormisda*'s Epistle to the Bishops of the Province of *Betica*. The Second Part is to be found in the Epistle of Pope *Antherus* and *Eusebius* to the Bishops of *Tuscany* and *Campania*; and at the latter End there are some Passages which are taken

out

out of Pope *Calistus*'s Decrees. This Pope's Life is so stuff'd with Absurdities and Inconsistencies, that it must needs prejudice any disinterested Person, and make him loath such confident Parasites as dare affirm such Contradictions for Truth.

[304] Pope *Marcellus* was a Person of so obscure a Character, that *Eusebius* and *Theodoret* knew nothing of him. But to fill up a Vacancy of Seven Years, (which the *Pontifical* owns, and the *Notes* deny) two Names are foisted in: And (which is a very common Thing among the Editors) there is more said of the most obscure and worthless, or of feigned Persons, than of the most real and deserving. The shameful Fiction of this *Marcellus*'s Life and Death, is by the *Roman Breviary* appointed to be read to the People for Lessons in their Churches. His Epistle to the Bishops of *Antioch* about the Supremacy is a ridiculous Story; for who will believe that the Bishop of *Rome* should contend for Superiority in the midst of a flagrant Persecution, or that St. *Peter* by Inspiration translated his Seat from *Antioch* to *Rome*? Yet these notorious Falshoods are defended by the Notes as if they were genuine Truths. *Bellarmine* cites this Epistle, *De Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14. to prove the *Supremacy*; and *Lib.* 1. *c.* 12. *de Conc.* to prove, that *no General Council ought to be called without the Order of the Bishop of* Rome. *Lindanus* also quotes this Epistle, to prove, *That all Bishops ought to appeal no where but to* Rome. *Panopl. l.* 4. *c.* 89. To prove all which, the *Editors* cite an *Apostolical* and *Nicene* Canon, tho' no such Canons are to be found. *Labb. T.* 1. *p.* 950. *Bin p.* 175. *col.* 2 *Baron. An.* 296. *n.* 5. Yet this Epistle is one of those which *Bellarmine*, in the foresaid Quotation, confesses he dare not affirm for genuine, because it bears Date under the Consulship of *Maxentius* and *Maximus*, who are taken Notice of

of by none about that Time, but the infamous *Pontifical*.

The Second Epistle to *Maxentius* is quoted by *Gratian*, to prove, *That no Synod ought to be called without the Authority of the Bishop of* Rome. *Dist.* 17. *Synod.* It's strange they should pick up no better Authorities for their Doctrines than Forgeries, of which there is not a more manifest one than this Epistle. For in the first Place, it's dated under the same Consuls as the former, and consequently of no better Authority. In the next Place, it's plain that Part of it is taken out of *Gregory*'s Epistles, writ almost 300 Years after this. *Labb. p.* 951. *Bin.* 387. *col.* 1. Besides, *Baronius* himself says there are many Inconsistencies that render it suspicious, *An.* 308. *n.* 24. particularly, that of shutting up young Children in Monasteries, and of shaving and veiling them, which Customs were not introduc'd till several Centuries after.

[305.] The Council of *Elvire*, in *Spain*, is the next in Course. This was a Council of Orthodox Bishops, as very plainly appears by the many excellent Canons relating to Church-Discipline, and which set before us the Severity and Strictness of Primitive Piety. Yet rather than lose their dear Supremacy, (for which they have broach'd so many Falshoods, and invented so many Forgeries) this Council must be ranged under a Bishop of *Rome*, *viz. Marcellus*, tho' it may be most justly questioned, whether there ever was such a Man in the World, as has been before observ'd. But the Editors cannot agree among themselves about the *Man*. *Binius* will have it under *Marcellus*; *Caranza* says, it was about the Time of Pope *Silvester*; but *Labbe* leaves it out of the Title. This Council made several Canons which directly oppose the Practices of the *Roman* Church, as the 26th Canon, which con-

contradicts their *Saturday Fasts*, and which *Caranza* most unjustly alters in the very Title of it, in these Words, *Every* Saturday *ought to be a Fast*. The 34th, under positive Pain of Excommunication, forbids Wax Candles to be lighted in the Day-time in the Burying-Places of the Saints. Yet see how *Caranza*, in a short Annotation, softens this. *But now*, says he, *the Church proves that Wax Candles ought to be lighted in the Day-time by its Practice.* Such Authority as this will justify any, tho' the most impious Practice. But he goes on, and says, *This Council therefore means not those, who publickly light up Wax Candles for the Worship and Glory of God; but Novices, who in Imitation of the Gentiles lighted Candles.* What will not they entertain, who will accept of such blundering Expositions. Though the 36th Canon (which decrees, *That Pictures or any Thing that is worship'd, shall not be painted on Church-Walls*) is rejected by many *Romish* Writers, who thought it could no Way be coloured by an Exposition or Annotation; yet the Notes boldly make this Canon assert what it confutes, by saying, *That it asserts the Honour and Worship due to Holy Images.* A pretty Way of arguing! Yet though this Council frequently condemns the modern Opinions and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, *Binius* dare not reject it, as some do, because Pope *Innocent* approves it; but however he varnishes those *Canons* which affect them with such Glosses, as he would have the World believe, this Council meant diametrically opposite to its own Decrees.

[309.] Pope *Eusebius*, as well as *Marcellus*, (as has been observ'd) was foisted into the Catalogue, to fill up a Vacancy of Seven Years. Tho' he was as obscure as his fictitious Predecessor, no Author of Note mentioning any Thing memorable of him, yet he must write Epistles; and Three

are laid to his Charge, which are cited upon several Occasions by *Bellarmine*. But these Cheats are so plain, that any Reader must blush at the Impudence of the Forgers, who dare impose such Falshoods on the World. *Labbee*, *p.* 1380. in the Margin, shews from what modern Authors they are stolen, and positively calls them spurious, yet does not reject them. To what End then do they publish what themselves own to be false and Counterfeit? Surely they lightly value their Church's Authority or Doctrines, who support either by such infamous Proofs.

[311.] Having coloured over this Seven Years Vacancy with the sham Pontificates of *Marcellus* and *Eusebius*, they continue their Succession (for that must be kept up at any Rate) with *Melchiades*, about whom the *Pontifical* and *Baronius* can't agree, one saying he reigned Three Years and seven Months, the other, that he reigned Two Years and two Months. No great Matter which! But then they ought to have been a little more exact in the Date of it, for by dating it under the Consulship of *Volusian* and *Rufin*, *Melchiades* must be supposed to have written this Epistle when he was dead. But that's a small Fault! Yet, notwithstanding this Epistle is so justly charged with Want of Credit, *Bellarmine* makes use of it to prove the *Universal Monarchy of the Church in the* Roman *Pontiff. l.* 2. *c.* 14. and that *Confirmation* is a *Sacrament. De Confirm. l.* 2. *c.* 3. But whoever was the Author of this Epistle, it is certain that the Beginning is taken out of Pope *Celestin*'s Epistle to the *French. Labb. T.* 1. *p.* 1395. And to vindicate an *Apostolick Privilege*, which they pretend was granted by our Blessed Saviour to St. *Peter*, *viz. That the Judging of Bishops was solely reserved to the Bishop of* Rome, they quote the 74th and 75th *Apostolick Canons*, which give it quite

 against

against them, and place the *Dernier resort* in a Synod. Now to quote an Author or Text in any Case, that does but barely seem to countenance or favour any Argument, is but Shuffling; but when Men shall positively refer to a Canon to justify their bold Assertions, and this Canon or Canons are directly contrary to what they lay down for Truth, these Men surely must have more than a common Share of Impudence, or else suppose that the World will believe all they say, and never trouble themselves to disprove them, by recurring to the Passages quoted. But this is the common Method, or else they would not dare to tell us so many of these Decretal Epistles are forged, and yet at the same Time defend them with Notes, and quote them upon Occasion for authentick Records. Thus *Bellarmine*, in this very Epistle, after he had quoted it for Proof, (as is already mentioned) at last tells us, *This is one of those Epistles which he cannot warrant.* A very pretty Way of perswading People to believe that to be true, which they see to be apparently false! Certainly this must be their Perswasion, or else to imagine the Ignorance of the People to be so gross, that they might impose any Thing on them, otherwise they would not in this Pope's Time so ridiculously mention the Council of *Nice*, which was not called till some Years after, and in another Pope's Time.

[313.] During the Papacy of *Melchiades*, there was a Council called at *Rome* by the Command (as *Cabbasutius* says, which is much to be wondered at) of *Constantine*. And so far was the Pope from being distinguished above others at that Time, that he was, by Delegation from the Emperor, join'd in Commission with Three *French* Bishops, and whom the Emperor in his Epistle calls his Collegues. And the Complaint against *Cecilian* Bishop

of

of *Carthage*, which was the Cause debated in this Council, was, tho' determined here, reheard in a *French* Council. By this Delegation it's plain the Supremacy and Infallibility had hitherto gained no Ground.

[314.] The Council of *Arles*, which the Editors own was called by the Command of *Constantine the Great*, is in many Places strangely perverted by them in Favour of their *Dear Supremacy*; which nothing weakens more than the very Title: For if it was called by *Constantine*'s Command, the Pope, who was obliged to obey, could not be *Supream*, nor was the sole Power of calling Councils vested in him. 'Tis pretty, truly, to see the Editors shuffling and tricking, tho' but for a Shadow of Grandeur. *Peter Crab*, in the Title, plainly tells us, that this Council of *Arles* was held in the Time of *Constantine* and *Sylvester*; but *Longus a Corialano*, that bold and confident Parasite of the Court of *Rome*, says, *The Council of* Arles *was held in the Time of Pope* Sylvester *and the Emperor* Constantine. This Author joins with *Binius* just such another as himself, in a ridiculous idle Story about the Emperor *Constantine*, as if, *at the Request of the Emperor, two hundred Bishops met. Among whom* Claudius *and* Vitus, *Presbyters, and* Eugenius *and* Cyriacus, *Deacons, sat as the Pope's Legates, and presided in this Council.* Very likely indeed that this Bishop's Legates should take Place of the Emperor!

It's notoriously known, that *Constantine* was born of Christian Parents, and educated under them, and was Thirty Years old when he enter'd on the Empire: And from the Year 306. *Baron. Ibid. n.* 14. he profess'd openly he was a Christian, encouraging Converts, suppressing Paganism, building and endowing Churches, *&c.* And therefore, whilst *Constantine* was doing so much for the Good

of

of the Church, *Sylvester* must not be idle, but must seem to make a Figure, though it be made up of nothing but Absurdities and Improbabilities; such as his miraculously curing *Constantine* of a Leprosy, which he never had; his Baptizing of him, and shewing him St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*; his Persecution under *Constantine*, and Flight to the Mountain *Soracte*; the great Figure he made at the Council of *Nice*, tho' no Author of any Credit takes the least Notice of him as any Way concerned in it, further than that he had two Proxies there; the Editors indeed make a mighty Bustle about him, as if he called the Council, and presided in it by his Legates, *Hosius*, *Vitus*, and *Vincentius*. *Vitus* and *Vincentius* indeed were his Proxies there, as *Socrates* says, *l.* 1. *c.* 5. But *Hosius* is named by no Body as a President, except the Editors. They try all the Ways they can to prove these Three to be Legates and Presidents, and among the rest they foist in the Subscriptions to the Canons of this Council to prove them so. But these, says *Richerius*, *Hist. Gen. Concil. l.* 1. *c.* 2. *n.* 6. are of as little Credit as the Epistle to *Sylvester*. It is strange they should invent so many ridiculous Fables, and such as are easily contradicted! The Preface to this Council says, that *Constantine* sat on a gilded Throne below all the Bishops; but *Eusebius*, who was an Eye-Witness, says, he sat above all the Bishops, *Vit. Constant. l.* 3. *c.* 10. As for the President of this Council, I think it is very plain from *Baronius*, *An.* 325. *n.* 73. who he was, even the same Person that called it, *viz.* the Emperor; for, says he, *He acted the Part of a Moderator in it.* This is much from *Baronius* indeed; but Truth will out sometimes. And yet *Richerius* (though a *Romanist*) goes further; *Hist. Con. c.* 2. § 2, 3, 4. saying, *It is clear by undoubted Testimonies, that the Appointing, Con-*

 vening;

residency of this Council depended on the Constantine. And he blames *Baronius* for wilfully mistaking the Pope's Con- ich was requisite as he was Bishop of an c Church) for his Authority, to which no P n that Age pretended. But a Proof, though a false one, must be fetch'd from early Antiquity to justify modern Abuses and Incroachments.

It's certain from *Socrates, Proœm. l.* 5. that after the Emperors became Christians, Matters of the Church so far depended on them, that it was by their Summons the greatest Councils were called. In which, as *Eusebius* says, *l.* 1. *Const. M. vitæ, c.* 37. *They sat and presided as* Communes Episcopi. And *Constantine* himself called this Council of *Nice, Ut pacem redderet Ecclesiæ, ac Disciplinam Ecclesiasticam sanciret, &c. That he might restore Peace to the Church, and establish her Discipline, ibid.* which at that Time was in great Danger of being ruined by the powerful Encroachments of *Arius* and his Disciples; and therefore it was Time for the Emperor to interpose his Power, and preserve the Church, which was in *apparent Danger*, by calling a Council. Not that he took upon him the Part of an arbitrary Judge, or domineering Tyrant, to determine Matters *ad libitum*; for, *Dissidium inter Episcopos subortum, & ad se ab Episcopis delatum placavit, He appeased the Disputes among the Bishops, ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 6. *ad* 24. And tho' as Emperor, he was Defender, and sat First in the Council, yet he was not sole President, for that himself disclaims. *Euseb. de vit. Const. l.* 4. *c.* 24. *Vos intra, ego extra Ecclesiam Episcopus a Deo constitutus; Ye are Bishops within the Church, without the Church I am a Bishop appointed by God.* And *Eusebius* says, *ib. l.* 3. *c.* 13. of the Emperor, that, *suam Orationem Præsidibus Concilii concessisse.* From whence it is plain, there were other Presidents; which *Felix* III. in his

his Epistle to the Emperor *Zeno*, allows: For he says, *Eustathius*, Patriarch of *Antioch*, *Præsidendi munus obiit*, *acted the Part of a President*. And *Photius*, *l. de 7. Synod*, says, that *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria* presided. In short, the Patriarchs, as Chiefs of their Clergy, sat above all the rest: Yet so as they gave Place to the Emperor when he came in.

[336.] *Sylvester* is succeeded by Pope *Mark*, who must not go off without making some Noise, and therefore they invent the most improbable Story imaginable, to make the World believe, that *Athanasius* sent an Epistle to Pope *Mark*, to desire him to send a true Copy of the *Nicene* Canons from *Rome*, because the *Arians* had burnt theirs at *Alexandria*. To which Pope *Mark* answers, that he had sent him 70 Canons. This by the Way is to persuade the World into a Belief of a greater Number of Canons constituted at *Nice* than Twenty. Which being so scandalous an Imposture, it may not be unpleasant to shew the Reader the Uses they were made to serve. They pretend there Eighty Canons made by this Council, which were translated out of *Arabick*, and publish'd by those Two modest Jesuits, *Turrianus* and *Alfonsus Pisanus*. How these Canons crept into *Arabick* I can't find, nor is it worth while to enquire, tho' without Doubt the two pious Editors of them had some great End in it. The Champions however of the *Pontificate* make the following Uses of these Canons. The Thirtieth Canon is cited by *Bellarmine*, *l. 1. c. 26. de Baptismo*, to prove, *That the Children of Christians ought not to be baptiz'd by Gentile Names*. The Nineteenth and Twentieth are quoted by *Stapleton*, *Pr in. Fid. Doctrin. Relect. p.* 398. to prove, *That it belongs to the Bishop of* Rome *only to confirm Councils, and that all Appeals ought to be made to him only*. The Forty

fourth is cited by *Cope, Dial.* 1. *c.* 12. in Defence of the *Supremacy*. The Sixty ninth is made Use of by *Bellarmine, l.* 1. *de Extrem. Unc. & l.* 2. *de Confirm. c.* 8. to prove, *Extream Unction to be a Sacrament; and that the Chrism, which is the Material of the Sacrament of Confirmation, ought to be consecrated and blessed first.* And the Sixty fifth is cited by *Coccius, To.* 2. *Thesaur. Cath. l.* 7. *p.* 850. in his Question about Prayer for the Dead. Now that these Canons are spurious, nothing is more certain and plain; for *Cecilian* Bishop of *Carthage*, who was present at this Council of *Nice*, reckons but Twenty. *Con. Carth.* 6. *c.* 9. St. *Augustine*, and Two hundred *African* Bishops, knew no more. St. *Cyril* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and *Atticus* Bishop of *Constantinople*, *Hist. Eccl. l.* 1. *c.* 6. say there were Twenty, no more nor less. The same appears likewise by *Ruffinus, Isidore*, and *Theodoret, in Princip. Conc. de Syn.* And notwithstanding the Annotator in *Labbé*, with a great deal of Assurance and Impertinence, says, *That it is manifest there were more than Twenty Canons made in this Synod*; yet, after all his Blustring and Nonsense, he dare not defend those Canons which *Turrian* and *Pisanus* father'd on this Council. Nay, their Oracle *Baronius* flies in their Face, and calls them Lyars; for, Theodoret *affirms there were but Twenty Canons made in this Council*, says he, *An.* 325. *n.* 156. *Vid. Coc. censur. p.* 227. 228.

But after all this Noise and Struggling, to prove what never was, it plainly appears that this pretended Judge of all Controversies, and supream Head of the Church, had so little Share in the Transactions of this Council, that it is very uncertain in what Pope's Time it was called. *Sozomen, Hist. l.* 1. *c.* 16. and *Nicephorus, l.* 8. *c.* 14. say, it was in the Time of *Julius*. Others think it was in *Sylvester's* Time. *Phocius* affirms, it was in the Times

of both *Sylvester* and *Julius*, *de 7. Syn.* though it is to be considered that Pope *Mark* came between.

But to return to this Epistle of Pope *Mark*, let us consider the Use made of it. Though *Binius* cites it to prove the *Supremacy* and *Infallibility* of the Bishop of *Rome*, and that there were more than Twenty Canons made at the Council of *Nice*; yet in his Notes he gives Five Reasons to prove them false, and *Labbé*, *T.* 2. *p.* 469. in the Margin, condemns them as spurious. Likewise *Bellarmine*, tho' he with *Baronius* and others suspects this Epistle, uses it to prove the papal *Infallibility* and Succession of St. *Peter* in the Ecclesiastick Monarchy, *De Verb. Dei*, *l.* 3. *c.* 5. It is quoted by *Canus*, *Loc. com. l.* 6. *c.* 4. to prove the Seventy Canons of the Council of *Nice*; and it is called by *Coster*, in his *Enchirid. Controv.* 3. *The most famous Epistle.* But it is most deservedly rejected by *Nannius* as suppositious for these Reasons; 1. When the Controversy was about the Number of the *Nicene* Canons between the Church of *Afric*, and the Popes *Zozimus* and *Boniface* I. (which was near an Hundred Years after) this Epistle was not so much as heard of, or any Way known. *Baron. An.* 336. *n.* 59. 2. In this Epistle it's said, Pope *Marcus* sent into *Egypt* to *Athanasius* the Seventy Canons of the Council of *Nice*, which *Athanasius* in his Letter to this Pope had desired of the Church of *Rome*. But this cannot be, according to *Baronius*, *An.* 336. *n.* 59. for this very Year *Athanasius* was banish'd into *France*. 3. This Epistle has the usual Stamp of Imposture upon it, for it is dated the X. *Cal.* of *November*, in the Consulship of *Nepotian* and *Facundus*, whereas on the Nones of *October* this very Year it is plain Pope *Mark* was dead. *Baron. ibid.*

[336.] Pope *Julius* succeeds *Mark*. And here the *Pontifical* and *Baronius* are together by the Ears again about the Consuls, in which the former is very much mistaken. In this Pope's Name several Epistles are published: Two of which are sufficiently proved false by *Cook*, *p.* 101, 102. The First is cited by *Bellarmine*, *de Rom. Pont. l.* 1. *c.* 23. to prove, *That all Consecration and Dignity is to be had of the Church of* Rome. It is also cited by *Greg. de Valent.* to prove, *The Bishop of* Rome *for the Time being to be St.* Peter's *Successor*. And by *Harding* against *Jewel*, *That all Things must have their Sanction from the Bishop of* Rome. But this Epistle is discovered by the old Mark; for it is dated in the Consulship of *Felicianus* and *Maximian*, tho' *Baronius* owns no such Person as *Maximian* in the Pontificate of *Julius*, *An* 337, *&c.*

The Second Epistle against the *Eastern* Bishops in the Behalf of *Athanasius*, is cited by *Bellarmine*, to prove, *That by a Decree of the Council of* Nice *all Causes of Moment ought to be decided by the Apostolick See. De Verb. Dei*, *l.* 3. *c.* 7. And by *Canus* in his *Loc. Com. l.* 6. *c.* 4. that by a Decree of the same Council, *All Bishops ought to appeal to the See of* Rome. But this is as easily proved a Forgery as any of the other. For, 1. It is, as the former, dated under the Consulship of *Felician* and *Maximian*. 2. It is utterly different from that undoubted and genuine Epistle of *Julius* which is to be seen in *Athanasius*, *Apolog.* 2. 3. It mentions many *Nicene* Canons, which are not to be found either in *Cecilian*'s, *Cyril*'s, or *Atticus*'s Copies, nor in any Author of Credit who collected the Canons of that Council. 4. This Epistle was no more known in the Time of the foresaid Controversy between the *African* Church and Popes *Zozimus* and *Bonifacius* I. than Pope *Mark*'s Epistle. By these and such like Arguments

guments even *Baronius* gives up the Cause, and declares he suspects this Epistle for a Forgery.

The Third Epistle from *Julius* to the *Arians*, is by *Baronius* and others own'd to be a Forgery, *Lab. T.* 2. *p.* 483. *Bin. p.* 387. *col.* 2. And *Binius*, in his Notes upon it, saith, *It is false, corrupted, and stolen out of divers Authors. Bin. p.* 391. *col.* 1. Yet the same *Binius* basely and unjustly quotes it over and over for the *Supremacy*, the Nullity of Councils not called by the Pope, and the Number of the *Nicene* Canons.

The Fourth Epistle is genuine, and if compared with the spurious ones, plainly shews it self to be authentick, both by the Style and Matter. No bullying for Superiority, but written in an humble Manner, without any Pretence or Claim to the modern Grandeur.

One Thing is worth noting in this Pope's Time, all his forg'd Epistles are dated under the foresaid mistaken Consuls; but his genuine Epistles bear no Date. They likewise put the same Date to a *Sham Roman* Council, with which they, to shew their Authority, pretend to confirm the *Nicene* Council. But this is so plain a Cheat, that not only the Date condemns it, but *Labb. Margin T.* 2. *p.* 527. says, 'tis patch'd up out of many Authors, and by that old Juggler *Isidore* lick'd into the Shape of Council. They pretend to have 117 Bishops in it, and *Baronius* and the Notes very methodically argue about the Time of this Sham Council, and the Bishops that sat in it, purely to persuade People into an Opinion of it, and that it was called for nothing but to confirm the Council of *Nice*, whose Acts and Canons could not be of any Force, till they had received their Sanction from him.

There were several Councils called during the Pontificate of *Julius*, which the Editors will have

called by the Authority of this Pope, though he had nothing to do in them: As in the Council of *Antioch*, which was called by the Emperor *Constantius*, who was present at it, and caused what Decrees he pleased to pass in it; and to shew how little they valued the Bishop of *Rome*, they decreed quite contrary to him in the Case of *Athanasius*. The Second Council of *Rome* under this Pope, I grant, was called by *Julius*; but Cardinal *Baronius* is guilty of the grossest Disingenuity possible: For having first said, that *Athanasius* and his Enemies having referred the Matter in Debate to *Julius's* Arbitration, and *Athanasius* coming to *Rome* after this Reference was, *Baronius* very unfaithfully makes this Inference from it; *Behold the Custom for injur'd Bishops; even from the* East, *to come to the Bishop of* Rome *for Redress*. *Baron. An.* 340. *n.* 2.

[342.] The *Eastern* Bishops, in a very sharp Epistle, expostulated with *Julius* in his Third *Roman* Council, for taking upon himself so far as to cite them to *Rome*, or to pretend to judge any Thing already determined by them in their own Synods. Which so soften'd *Julius*, that instead of claiming any Authority over them, he becomes a suppliant Orator for *Athanasius*.

It is worth Notice, that the Council of *Antioch*, though composed of *Arians*, who had made a new *Creed*, is entitled under *Julius*; but this is to keep up the pretended *Supremacy*, though in a very infamous Way.

They extol the Council of *Sardis* to the Skies, because it speaks some Things which seem to favour them; and therefore they would persuade us that they had something to do in it. But it was so very little, that they neither called it, nor presided in it. For if we will believe *Sozomen*, *l.* 1. *c.* 19. *Socrates*, *l.* 2. *c.* 16. and *Theodoret*, *l.* 2. *c.* 5. we shall

shall find, that the Emperors *Constans* and *Constantius* gave Order for this Council to meet. And tho' the Preface boldly affirms, that *Hosius*, *Archidamus* and *Philoxenus*, presided in the Name of Pope *Julius*, which is directly false; it's certain *Julius* subscribed by his two Presbyters, *Archidamus* and *Philoxenus*, who properly were his Legates; and for *Hosius*, it's plain he was no Pope's Legate, for he subscribed in his own Name.

It is plain, that when *Athanasius* and his Enemies referr'd their Cause to the Arbitration of *Julius*, they referr'd it to him as a Judge chosen by them, and not to him as Universal Ecclesiastick Monarch; and therefore when *Ursacius* and *Valens*, two *Arian* Hereticks, abjur'd their Heresy, and recanted their false Evidence against *Athanasius*, they went to *Rome*, and in Writing delivered their Recantation to Pope *Julius*, who having before been Arbitrator in the Cause, was the fittest Person to receive these Men's Confessions. Yet from hence the Notes make this base Inference, *That since the Matter was greater than that a Synod at* Milan *(tho' the* Roman *Presbyters were present at it) could dispatch it, and lest the ancient Custom of the Catholick Church should be broken*, viz. *for eminent Hereticks to abjure their Heresies only at* Rome, *they sent them to* Julius, *that having before him their penitential Letter, they might make their Confession, the whole* Roman *Church looking on.* This is so sly an Insinuation, that none but Men of the most profligate and corrupt Morals would from thence make such base Inferences. It is very unreasonable to suppose, that when two Parties chose a single Arbitrator in one particular Case, that upon this Arbitration, an universal Supremacy in all other Cases should be founded. As Pope *Julius* was by both chosen Arbitrator, he was the propereſt Person to receive the Confessions of the Delinquents;

linquents; but it is very prepostorous from thence to conclude, that it always was the Custom for eminent Hereticks to abjure their Heresies at *Rome*. Besides, it is plain from the Council held at *Jerusalem*, *A. D.* 350. that Hereticks, and eminent ones too, no less than Bishops, have recanted their Heresies at other Places than *Rome*. For *Athanasius*, upon his Return from Banishment at *Jerusalem*, was present at a Council called there by *Maximus*, Bishop thereof, without the Knowledge or Consent of the Bishop of *Rome*. At which Time those Bishops who had before subscrib'd to the Sentence against *Athanasius*, recanted their Fault, and abjur'd the *Arian* Heresy in the Presence of *Athanasius*. There could not be more eminent Hereticks at that Time than *Arians*, nor more considerable Men for Figure in the Church than Bishops; yet such as these they were that repented, and abjur'd their Heresy, and were restored to the Communion of the Church, without offering to go, or being cited to *Rome* to recant there.

Before we leave this Pope, I will do him more Honour in a short Truth of him, than all the fawning Sycophants have by their fulsome Falshoods. For when they meet with an advantageous Piece of authentick History, they murder the Person represented in it by some incredible Lie. As to Pope *Julius*, he was certainly right in the Case of *Athanasius*, and acted with the Sincerity becoming a Bishop of the First See. He pleaded heartily for him to the *Eastern* Bishops that had condemned him, that being Bishop of an Apostolical See, *viz. Alexandria*, they ought not to have condemned him, till they had acquainted the Bishops of the *West*, and especially him as the First, that so the Matter might have been debated and determined in Council. *Baron. An.* 341. *n.* 56, 57. It is

is a great Scandal to the Church of *Rome*, that many of their Bishops, who were Men of great Piety and Goodness, should have their Memories daub'd by the Pens of such nauseous Flatterers: For it is certain many of them would appear more glorious in their true Characters, and more becoming that high Post they held in the Church, if these Pretenders to Antiquity had not undertaken the Description of them, and Things which they had no Ground for.

[352.] We come next to the greatest Instance of humane Frailty that Ecclesiastick History affords, in the Person of Pope *Liberius*; whose many Fallings from the Church into Heresy shew the *Infallibility* to be but ill founded in St. *Peter*'s Chair. The Editors and the Notes are so very hardly put to it to cover these Failings of one of their *Infallible* Guides, that all their Doubles and Shifts cannot blind any Reader of common Capacity. The Charge against him is positive and unanswerable, and from themselves. *Binius*, in his Notes on 7 *Ep. Liber. Labb. T.* 2. *p.* 751. *Bin. p.* 470. *col.* 1. says, *he unhappily fell*: And *Labb. p.* 743. and *Bin. p.* 466. *col.* 2. That *he basely fell*; and that *he consented to the Depriving of* Athanasius, *admitted* Arians *to his Communion, and subscribed an* Arian *Confession of Faith*, as *Athanasius*, *Hilary*, and *Hierome*, witness. Yet they will not own he erred in Faith, *but that by his Falling he cast a base Blot upon his Life and Manners.* Lab. 783. Bin. 479. col. 2. And though they have positively said, That he communicated with *Arians*, (which, I think, or nothing, makes a Man a Heretick) yet they impudently say, *It is a false Calumny of the Hereticks, to say*, Liberius *was infected with the* Arian *Heresy*. Lab. 741. Bin. 465. col. 2. In the Life of *Liberius*, *p.* 50. *Platina* says, *Liberius* did in all Things *agree with the Hereticks, and was of the*

the same Opinion with the Arians. And can this Man be said to be Orthodox? Yes; and Cardinal *Baronius* will affirm it: For notwithstanding, *An.* 357. *n.* 33, 34, *&* 35. he owns, *That* Liberius *subscribed Heresy*, (the Cause of which, by the way, (as the Cardinal, *ibid.* acknowledges) was his Ambition of regaining his Bishoprick;) yet he a little after denies, that Liberius *was an Heretick*, pretending that he sign'd the First Confession of *Sirmium*, which was not down-right Heresy; tho', *An.* 359. *n.* 10. he declares, That the Catholick People of *Rome* esteemed *Liberius* to be an Heretick, and would not have Communion with him; for which he cruelly persecuted them. A pretty Way of reconciling Contradictions, to make an Heretical Persecuting Pope Orthodox! And yet they are so full of these, that the very Pope *Felix*, who was put into *Liberius*'s Place by *Arians*, must be a good *Catholick*. And now, after all that *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, *Binius*, *Labbé*, and all the Champions for the Pontificate, can say or do, they cannot but own, (nay, they do, and then deny it) that they have had Two Popes at once falling so notoriously into Schism, that the very Lay-People refused their Communion.

There are several Epistles, with a Preface before them, palm'd upon this Pope; *Two of which*, which seem to be the most genuine, this Preface saith, *were feigned by the* Arians, *Lab. p.* 744. *Bin. p.* 467. *col.* 1. and *yet these Two are found in the Fragments of St.* Hilary, *among which it is not probable there should be any Fiction of the* Arians. But that which makes them reject this Epistle is because they say, Liberius *did condemn* Athanasius *in the Beginning of his Papacy*. Nor was this the only Time that he condemned *Athanasius*.

When

When he wrote his Seventh Epiſtle, which they allow to be genuine, he was an *Arian* without Diſpute; for he calls the Arian *Biſhops, his moſt beloved Brethren, allows the Condemnation of* Athanaſius *to be juſt, and owns his receiving the Sirmian Creed as Catholick.* Lab. p. 751. Bin. 469. col. 2.

The Eleventh Epiſtle of this Pope is genuine, for it is recorded by *Socrates, l.* 4. *c.* 11. and yet the Notes, to hide *Liberius*'s being a Heretick, ſoftly ſay, he was *ſo eaſy, as to receive the* Semi-Arians *to Communion, and to commend their Faith, as the ſame which was decreed at* Nice. A fine Fetch indeed, to call his Erring in Matters of Faith *Eaſineſs*, and his being Deceived a Token of his *Infallibility!*

The Twelfth (or, as *Labbé* calls it, the Fourteenth) Epiſtle, is a manifeſt Forgery. *Lab. Ep.* 14. *p.* 760. *Bin. Ep.* 12. *p.* 472. *col.* 2. And ſo are the Two next, as *Binius* and *Labbé* confeſs. *Lab.* 763. *Bin.* 474. *col.* 2. But the Forger of this Epiſtle had but a bad Hand at Chronology; for he abſurdly brings in *Liberius* under *Julian* or *Valens*, (in one of whoſe Reigns this Epiſtle was written) *threatening Offenders with the Emperor's Indignation, with Deprivation; yea, with Proſcription, Baniſhment, and Stripes.* Labb. p. 767. Bin. 474. col. 2.

Nor have the Friends of the Pontificate, by theſe ridiculous Stories and Forgeries, leſs wounded their Imaginary *Supremacy*, than their *Infallibility*. In which *Liberius* was no ſmall Inſtrument; for in his Eleventh Epiſtle he ſtyles himſelf only Biſhop of *Italy*, and ſaying, *He was the meaneſt of Biſhops, and rejoiced that thoſe in the Eaſt did agree with him in Matters of Faith.* But *Baronius* uſes a very unfair Way to conceal this Condeſcention of the Pope, for he alters the Pointing; *Liberius Epiſcopus, Italiæ & alii*, & making *Liberius* the Grand Biſhop, and the

reſt

reſt Biſhops of *Italy*. But theſe Tricks are not ſtrange Things with them.

Their Fondneſs in affirming all Councils were or ought to be call'd by the Pope only, hath betray'd them to much Contempt, and expoſed them for their notorious Diſingenuity. Nay, the Power of the Biſhop of *Rome*, not only in *Liberius*'s Time, but long after, was ſo inconſiderable, that though *Liberius* call'd a Council at *Rome*, *A. D.* 352. to clear *Athanaſius*; yet, being ſenſible how inſignificant his Authority was, he and the reſt of the Biſhops agreed to petition the Emperor for another Council, to confirm what they had done at *Rome*.

The Council of *Milan*, which they vainly call a General Council, though in *Italy*, and under the Pope's Noſe, was not, as they ſay, call'd by *Liberius*, but by the Emperor *Conſtantius*; for *Sozomen* poſitively declares, *l.* 4. *c.* 8. *That* Conſtantius *ſummoned all the Biſhops to* Milan; and *Baronius*, *An.* 355. *n.* 2. ſaith, *the Emperor call'd them together.*

As to that idle Notion, That none but the Pope can call a *General Council*, it's plain they impoſe upon the World, and contradict themſelves too: For the Council of *Ariminum*, which the Editors ſtyle a *General Council*, is not entitled under him, not ſaid to be call'd by him, (for he had no Hand in it) but, as is on all Hands agreed, was call'd by the Emperor *Conſtantius*, *Sulpic. Sever. Hiſt. l.* 2. who call'd for the Decrees of this Synod to confirm them, *Lab. p.* 794. *Bin. p* 482. *col.* 2. which the Orthodox Biſhops obey'd. And it's certain, that what *Conſtantius* in his Epiſtle declares, *about the Unreaſonableneſs of a Weſtern Council determining any Thing againſt Eaſtern Biſhops*, excluded the Biſhop of *Rome* from all Power of calling Councils out of his proper Diſtrict. This is plain from *Athanaſius*'s Calling a Council at *Alexandria*, *A. D.* 362. upon his

Return from his Third Exile. This Council was call'd upon the Account of ſome Differences among the Catholicks, about the Manner of explaining the Trinity, and on what Terms recanting *Arians* were to be received into the Church. And though neither *Athanaſius*, nor any ancient Hiſtorian, mention the Pope in this conſiderable Action, yet the Editors out of *Baronius* ſay, *it was call'd by the Advice and Authority of* Liberius: Which cannot fairly be ſuppos'd, for *Liberius* at that Time was an *Arian*, and therefore very unlikely to call an Orthodox Synod. Nor can any Man be ſo blind as to believe, that *Euſebius* and *Lucifer Calaritanus* were the Pope's Legates at this Council; for as to *Lucifer*, he was at that Time at *Antioch*, as appears by his ſending Two Deacons to *Alexandria* to ſubſcribe for him; and the Synodical Epiſtle of this Council to *Euſebius*, *Lucifer*, and others, plainly ſhews they were not preſent at this Council, and conſequently no Pope's Legates. They produce many Teſtimonies in their Defence out of Tracts which are ſpurious, and ſome out of the Acts of the Second *Nicene* Council; which being notoriouſly infamous, are not worth recounting. However, we may ſafely conclude with *Nazianzen*, *That* Athanaſius *in this Synod gave Laws to the whole World.* Baron. An. 362. Tom. 4. p. 66, 73. Lab. p. 809. Bin. p. 487. col. 1.

There were ſeveral Councils in this Pope's Time call'd in *France* by *Hilary* Biſhop of *Poictiers*, and the Catholick Faith ſettled in them; but no Pope mention'd; nor yet in that Orthodox Synod at *Alexandria*, wherein *Athanaſius* and his Suffragans preſented a Confeſſion of their Faith to *Jovian* the Emperor. Theſe were ſuch eminent Actions, that if the Biſhop of *Rome* had been any way concern'd in them, it had been impoſſible he ſhould

should have been every where omitted. But we may plainly from these infer, that *Liberius* at this Time either was a Heretick, or made but a mean Figure.

As to the Power of calling Councils, which the Bishop of *Rome* claims, it's plain there's nothing in it beyond his own District: Which we will make appear in a few Instances. Upon *Valentinian*'s Advancement to the Empire, the Eastern Bishops petition him to call a Council; and he being busy, told them they might call it where they pleas'd: Which Petition, and the Leave granted, shew, that the Right of Calling Councils was in him, as was also the Confirming them; as appears from the Bishops sending the Acts of this Council (at *Lampsacus*, *A. D.* 365.) to the Emperor *Valens* to be confirm'd. *Sozom. l. 6. c. 7.*

The Council of *Aquileia*, *A. D.* 381. in the Case of *Palladius* and other *Arians*, was absolutely call'd by the Emperor; in which, *Valerian* Bishop of *Aquileia*, and *Ambrose* Bishop of *Milan*, presided. This being so undeniably plain, that it could admit of no Controverting, the Editors change their Note, and do not say in the Title as usually, *under such or such a Pope*, but, *in the Time of* Damasus. They might with as much Colour have said, in the Time of St. *Ambrose*, *Chrysostome*, or *Jerome*. Nay, *Damasus* is not so much as named; nor had he any Representative there, although this Council was call'd in *Italy*, and to confirm an Article of Faith. *Labbé*, *p.* 980. in the Acts of this Synod, like the rest of the Editors, produces an Authority, which cuts the *Supremacy* down at once; for he brings in St. *Ambrose* speaking thus: *In former Times the Practice was, That the Eastern Bishops had their Councils in the East, and Western Bishops in the West. We in the West held our Council at* Aquileia, *by the Command*

Command of the Emperor. Now what can be plainer, than that at this Time the Fathers of the Weſtern Church were altogether ignorant of that *Univerſal Power* which the *Roman Pontiffs* have ſince uſurp'd, or that the Emperor had the ſole Power of calling Councils?

The Notes ſay, *That the Second General Council of* Conſtantinople *was gather'd by the Authority of Pope* Damaſus, *and the Favour of* Theodoſius, *Bin. p.* 540. The Preface to this Council ſays, *it was call'd by the Emperor, not without* Damaſus's *Authority.* Baron. An. 380. p. 359, & 362. A pretty Way of blending the Imperial and Papal Authority! But this will not paſs; for this Council's Letter to *Theodoſius* ſays, *We were call'd together by your Epiſtle.* Lab. p. 946. Bin. p. 533. And when they were to have met at *Rome*, they affirm, *That* Damaſus *ſummon'd them to meet there by the Emperor's Letters.* Ep. ad Dam. Bin. 539. *Socrates* alſo, *l.* 5. *c.* 8. and *Sozomen, l.* 7. *c.* 7. expreſly ſay, *The Emperor call'd this Synod at* Conſtantinople: But the Preface and Notes confidently aver, *That they ſent their Acts to* Damaſus *to be approved, and he did confirm them.* Lab. p. 917, & 997. Bin. p. 521, & 541. Yet they tell us, That Pope *Gregory* above 200 Years after declared, *That the Church of* Rome *as yet neither had nor received the Acts of this Council:* A ſtrange Contradiction, that a Church ſhould confirm what it had not ſeen! Yet notwithſtanding theſe irreconcileable Aſſertions, both *Labbe, p.* 946. and *Binius, p.* 533. ſay, *That the Biſhops deſire* Theodoſius *by his pious Edict to confirm the Decrees of this Synod.*

[366.] The *Pontifical* differs in its own Account of Pope *Felix*; for in the Life of *Liberius* it ſaith, he died in Peace: But here in the Life of *Felix* it ſaith, he was martyr'd by *Conſtantius.* Their Accounts about him are ſo irreconcileable, that the

Editors themſelves can make nothing fairly out about him. We will paſs on to the Epiſtles aſcribed to him; which are the moſt groſs Forgeries hitherto compiled: And notwithſtanding they are ſo, and own'd as ſuch by *Labb. in marg. p.* 844, *&* 849. they inſert them; nay, they have often quoted ſeveral of their forged Epiſtles and Decrees, at a Diſtance, for Authentick. The Firſt Epiſtle diſcovers it ſelf by the Title, *To the moſt Reverend Brethren*, Athanaſius, *&c.* Felix *Biſhop of the* Roman *City and Univerſal Church*, &c. This we are to ſwallow without examining; for if the Pope ſays, he is Univerſal Biſhop, Who dare queſtion it? This Epiſtle is dated in the Conſulſhip of *Agarius* and *Julian*; though none that ever wrote of the *Roman* Conſuls makes any Mention of *Agarius. Pet. Crab. Annot.* in this Epiſtle, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 363. Beſides, the latter Part of it is taken *verbatim* out of Pope *Felix* I. his Epiſtle to the *Gallican* Biſhops. But how great a Forgery ſoever it be, if it anſwers any End, it muſt be recurr'd to as an Authentick Regiſter. And therefore it is cited by *Canus* in his *Loc. Com. l.* 6. *c.* 4. *p.* 196. to prove, That the Hereticks had expung'd ſeveral Canons out of the *Nicene* Council. And by *Stapleton*, to prove, *That all the World ought to appeal to the Biſhop of* Rome.

The Title of the Second Epiſtle runs much like the former: Felix, *Pope of the Holy Univerſal Church*, &c. and has the ſame Tokens of Impoſture.

The Third Epiſtle, according to *Labb. in marg. p.* 857. is a plain Forgery, being ſtolen out of Pope *Martin* I. in his *Lateran* Council. And though *Binius* himſelf very often cites the Two Firſt Epiſtles, yet in his Notes on them he owns they are of no Credit. Strange Infatuation and Deluſion, to declare a Thing a Cheat, and at the ſame Time embrace it for Truth! *Bin. p.* 499. *col.* 1. *Lab. p.* 849.

[367.] Pope

[367.] Pope *Damasus* enters the Papacy in Blood; for his Competitor *Ursicinus*, not strong enough to resist *Damasus*'s Party, had many of his slain in a Church. 'Tis plain enough, Ambition, and not Religion, put them upon this; for the Luxury and Pomp of the Clergy at that Time made many good Men reflect on them. St. *Basil* charges them with Pride; and St. *Hierome*, the great Friend of that Church, could not forbear accusing them of the foresaid Vices.

The Epistle of *Aurelius* Bishop of *Carthage*, to *Damasus*, and his Answer, are a couple of Forgeries: For *it is plain* (says *Baronius*) *by the Date of these Epistles, (which is in the Consulship of* Gratian *and* Siricius) *that* Aurelius *was but a Deacon* 15 *Years after.* An. 377. n. 11. And yet, though this is so notorious and scandalous a Forgery, *Gratian* quotes it, to prove, *That it is Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost to break the Pontifical Canons.* 25 q. 1. violat.

His Two Epistles to *Paulinus* and the *Eastern* Bishops are very suspicious; and that to St. *Hierome* is an evident Forgery. His Epistle to the Bishops of *Numidia*, about the *Chorepiscopi*, or *Local-Bishops*, is easy to be proved a Cheat for several Reasons. First, it is dated under the Consuls *Libius* and *Theodosius*, whom no Annalist ever took Notice of as such. This is by *Duarenus, de Sac. Eccl. Min. &c. l.* 1. *c.* 9. accounted an empty vain Story; and truly, as *Cook* says, he might have call'd it childish and ridiculous: For what could be more silly and weak, than to tell the Bishops, that the *Word* Episcoporum *implied the Plural Number, and that, according to the Grammarians, it was the Genitive Case Plural.* Happy Discovery, One and One make Two! But besides, the latter Part of this Epistle is taken out of Pope *John* III.'s Epistle to the Bishops of *Germany* and *Gaul.* They shew a strong

Inclination to Knavery; but, like Thieves, have the ill Luck to be discovered.

Damasus's Epistle to *Stephen* Archbishop of the Council of *Mauritania* (mark the Blunder) is suppositious, for this and other Reasons; for it is dated in the Consulship of *Flavius* and *Stilico*, who were not Consuls till Twenty Years after *Damasus*'s Death; and in the Body of it there is a forged Epistle of *Felix* quoted, which *Binius*, *p.* 499. owns to be spurious. *Stephen*'s Answer to it is of the same Leaven, which is plain by the Barbarisms in it. His Epistle to the Bishops of *Italy* is false dated, and so are the rest: And yet these are the Proofs that must support their whimsical Doctrines; this is their Store-house of Testimony: But their Topicks are very unfortunate, to have no better Proof than Forgeries, and which are not only discovered by others, but such as generally are own'd by themselves; which Acknowledgment would carry some Face of Sincerity with it, if it were not yoak'd with an Assurance that would palm what they call Forgery upon the World for real Truths. Now though, as has been plainly prov'd, these Epistles are a Bundle of Lies and Nonsense, yet they are quoted for several Ends, (I suppose for which they were fram'd.) The Epistle of *Damasus* to *Stephen* is cited by *Bellarmine*, *de Verbo Dei*, *l.* 3. *c.* 7. to prove, *That all Causes of Moment ought to be tried before the Apostolick Judge.* And the Answer of *Stephen*, by the same Author, *de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 31. to prove, That the Bishop of *Rome* ought to be call'd, *Father of Fathers, and Chief Pontiff.*

[385.] Pope *Siricius* was a Man of so mean a Character, that though he sate 13 or 14 Years, yet both before and after his Election there is little can be found worth recounting of him. However,

ever, like his Predeceſſor, he mounted the Papal Throne not without Trouble; for the ſame Competitor, *viz. Urſicinus*, ſtruggles with him for it, but loſes it. It's probable he might be one of thoſe *Literati* with which, about this Time, the *Roman* Church was plentifully ſtock'd, inſomuch that St. *Hierome* ſays, *Not one of them did pretend to Learning*, &c. *Hieron. Præf. ad Didym. de Spir. Sanct.* which is highly probable, if we conſider the Decretal Epiſtles of this Pope, which for their Nonſenſe, Impertinence, and hungry Style, ſeem to be the genuine Product of thoſe dull Times. The Firſt Epiſtle is ſevere againſt Marriage, which they endeavour to decry, but do it weakly; for they not only miſapply Texts of Scripture, but ſpeak prophanely of an Ordinance which God calls Holy, and oppoſe St. *Paul*, who ſays, *Heb.* 13. 4. *Marriage is honourable in all Men, not the Clergy excepted.*

The Second Epiſtle is ſuſpicious; but let its harſh and barbarous Style ſave it for once.

The Anſwer to this Epiſtle from the Council of *Milan* ſeems patch'd up out of ſeveral Authors, who wrote upon this Subject: But their making St. *Ambroſe* in it call the Pope *Brother*, (which looks forc'd, and againſt the Grain) and complimenting him as a *Great Maſter and Doctor*, does not look altogether like Truth; for St. *Ambroſe* made a much greater Figure than any Biſhop of *Rome* in his Time: And I cannot eaſily be perſuaded, that St. *Ambroſe* would call him a *Great Maſter and Doctor*, who at that Time, according to the beſt, nay, even the Editors own Accounts, and eſpecially the Epiſtles, was not only ignorant, but a Patron of Ignorance.

The Third Epiſtle for Style is like the former, which the Editors are very fond of, for in it the

Pope saith, *He hath the Care of all the Churches*; which can be meant no otherwise than of all the *Suburbicarian* Churches: For *Aurelius* Bishop of *Carthage*, uses the same Expression, by which undoubtedly he meant only the Churches of his own Province, and not of the whole World, as *Binius* idly notes of *Siricius*.

The Fourth Epistle calls the Pope no more than *Primate*; which so sowres *Labbé*, that he fairly confesses the Truth, and tells us it is stolen out of *Innocent*'s Epistle to *Victritius*; which he would scarcely have done, had not the Appellation seem'd to detract from the *Supremacy*.

About this Time was said to be held the Second Council of *Arles*, which was but Provincial, and which condemned the Followers of *Photinus* and *Bonosus*. The Title says, it was held in the Time of Pope *Siricius*; and so it was in the Time of those it condemned. But for this there may be divers Reasons: First, without so much as naming the Bishop of *Rome*, they resolve all Ecclesiastical Matters to the Determination of their Metropolitan and his Synod. But, Secondly, perhaps they, and not without Reason, suspected this Council, and therefore would not own it as held under the Pope. And truly there is one Thing very odd in it, and which renders it suspicious; for in *Can.* 24. it is decreed, *That Accusers of the Brethren shall be proceeded against according to the Council of* Nice. Now the Council of *Nice* mentions nothing of the Matter in the Genuine Canons. But they are resolv'd they will make something of the Matter to their Advantage; and therefore *Crabb*, and *Longus a Coriolano* from him, infer, That there were more than Twenty Canons made at that Council, because this here quoted, and referring to the Council, is not among the Twenty. And here the Editors are

at

at their old Sport of raiſing Authority from what they had before condemned, and condemning what they had before approved: Particularly *Crabb*, (who I verily think is the honeſteſt of them;) for after he has rail'd againſt ſome Obſcurities in the following Canons, the 28th Canon mentioning the Council of *Vaſes*, he takes Opportunity to fall foul upon this Council, and detect it for ſpurious, by alledging, *That the Council of* Vaſes *was long after in the Time of Pope* Leo.

The Council of *Hippo* is by the Editors dated under *Siricius*, though it was held in *Afric* in a plenary Convention of Biſhops, and who ſeldom or never acknowledged the *Roman* Biſhops *Supremacy*: Beſides, the Canons made in it related to the Government of the *African* Church; whoſe Biſhops would not allow the Biſhop of *Rome* to have any Thing to do in it.

[398.] As for Pope *Anaſtaſius*, there had little been ſaid of him, if it had not been for his Friend St. *Hierome*, whom he ſo much obliged by condemning *Ruffinus*, a Diſciple of *Origen*, that St. *Hierome* thought he could do no leſs than mention him with Honour and Reſpect; which he knew very well how to do. There are Three Decretal Epiſtles publiſhed for this Pope. *Baronius* mentions only Two, which he detects of Forgery by the Date, which is 14 Years before *Anaſtaſius* was Pope, *Arcadius* and *Bauto* being Conſuls. But he ſays, the greateſt Part of it is taken out of *Leo the Great*'s Second Epiſtle to all the Biſhops of the Church, which diſcovers the Cheat. *Baron. An.* 402. *n.* 48. *Crabb* and *Labbé* are of the ſame Opinion. Yet *Bellarmine* quotes it to prove the *People ought to hear the Goſpel ſtanding*. De Miſſ. l. 2. c. 16. But there is yet another ſhameful Piece of Falſhood in this Epiſtle. It is directed to the Biſhops of *Germany*

and *Burgundy*; though *Burgundy* did not receive the Christian Faith till the Year 413. However, notwithstanding the palpable Detection of this Forgery, they will not quit it for the Sake of one Passage in it for the *Supremacy*, where *the* German *Bishops are advised to send to him as the Head.*

The Second Epistle is also spurious, being dated 15 or 16 Years after *Anastasius*'s Death, and stolen out of *Leo*'s 59th Epistle.

The Third may be genuine by the Style, which shews the Author of it to be but a mean Orator, and utterly ignorant of the Greek Tongue; for he declares, *He knew not who* Origen *was, nor what Opinions he held, till his Works were translated into Latin.*

The Notes make a mighty Noise about nothing in the Fourth Council of *Carthage*; for though that Church never allowed the Pope to meddle by Way of Supreme in their Discipline, yet they will drag in a Pope to sit at the Head of these Councils; though in this they cannot agree, whether it shall be under *Anastasius* or *Zosimus*. But by the Title it's plain it was call'd by *Aurelius* Bishop of *Carthage*, in the Consulship of *Honorius* and *Eutychianus*, where the Bishops, without the Assistance of the Pope, made many excellent Canons: The 51st, 52d, and 53d of which are very severe against the great Numbers of idle, useless, vagrant, mendicant Monks, who in those Times would have been compell'd to have found an honester and more reputable Way of maintaining themselves than by begging.

The Hundredth Canon of this Council is most strangely inverted. The Canon runs thus: *Let no Woman presume to baptize.* But *Gratian, de Consecrat. District.* 4. *cap. Mulier.* hath corrupted it, by adding, *Except in Case of Necessity.* Which shews to what

Extremity they are brought, when they are forc'd to maintain their *Baptism by Women*, and other Lay-People, by such Forgeries as these. *Peter Lombard*, *l.4. sent. dist. 6. p.* 303. on the Sentences does the same: Which Two, as Dr. *James* truly says in his *Corruption of the Fathers*, &c. *p.* 207, 208. may be call'd *Brethren in Iniquity*; for they have foisted in of their own Heads the Exception in this Canon, contrary to the Faith of the MSS. and Printed Copies.

The last Council of this Century was at *Alexandria*, and call'd by *Theophilus*, who found out and condemned the Errors of *Origen* long before *Anastasius* knew any Thing of the Matter; and yet they have the Face to say it was under *Anastasius*; though it was Two Years after this Council sate, before St. *Hierome* could persuade *Anastasius* to condemn the Opinion of *Origen*, which this Council had first censur'd. *Baronius* deals very unfairly in the Case of the Decrees of this Synod being sent by them to *Anastasius*; for it is but upon meer Conjecture, saying, *That it is fit we should believe this.* A very pretty Authority for *People to depend on!* But there is no Proof for this; for it is certain that *Theophilus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and President of this Council, sent them to *Epiphanius*, to *Chrysostome*, and *Hierome*; from which last it is most probable *Anastasius* received them.

[399.] There was a Council call'd at *Carthage*, which the Editors, after their usual Custom, put under *Anastasius*, as if summoned by his Authority. But he was so far from being any way concerned in it, that the Two Bishops, *Epigonius* and *Vincentius*, that were delegated by this Council to the Emperor *Honorius* with a Petition, obtained their Request of him without the Advice or Assistance of *Anastasius*: And yet this was a Case in which

it

it would have highly behov'd all good Men, and especially Bishops, to give their helping Hand, for it related wholly to Church-Matters; so that Bishops only should judge offending Clergy: That Relicts of Idols should be expell'd the Province of *Afric*: That Pagan Banquets and Theatrical Sports should not be used on Sundays, or other Christian Festivals, *&c.* These were of such Moment, that required every Body's Help; and yet we do not find *Anastasius* moved the least in it: Which perhaps may be the Reason why *Binius* makes so great a Concession as to say, *That in the* African *Church none call'd a Council, or presided in it, but the Bishop of* Carthage. This, surely, could be for no other Intent than to excuse *Anastasius* for his Remisness in this grand Affair.

[402.] Pope *Innocent* I. comes next upon the Stage, whom the Editors load with several forg'd Epistles. The First of which to *Decentius* is cited by *Bellarmine, de Confirm. c.* 3. to prove Confirmation a Sacrament. By the same, *in l.* 2. *de Bon. Oper. in partic. c.* 18. to prove the *Sunday-Fast*: And *in l.* 3. *de pœnit.* to prove Auricular Confession. But *Cook, p.* 105. takes this Epistle to task very handsomely. In this Epistle it's said, *'Tis manifest, that no Body instituted Churches in* Italy, Spain, Gaul, Afric, Sicily, *or the interjacent Isles, except those whom the Blessed Apostle* Peter *and his Successors appointed Priests.* This is so obvious and gross a Forgery, that no Body can imagine *Innocent* the Author of it: For it is plain in the Acts of the Apostles, *c.* 28. that St. *Paul* taught in *Italy*. It is likewise plain from several of the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers, that St. *Paul* taught in *Spain*. *Athanas. Ep. ad Dracont. Theodoret. in Ep. ad Philip. c.* 1. *&c.*

Pope *Innocent*'s Epistle to *Victritius* is cited by *Bellarmine*, to prove *Cœlibacy* to be an Apostolick Institution,

ſtitution, and juſtly annex'd to *Holy Orders*, &c. But this Epiſtle to a Word is the ſame with that of Pope *Siricius* to the Biſhops of *Afric*, and therefore ought not to be laid at *Innocent*'s Door.

This Pope's Epiſtle to *Exuperius* is cited by *Bellarmine*, to prove the Books of *Tobit*, *Judith*, &c. to be canonical Scripture; and that Matrimony was a Tie indiſſolvable. But in it there are ſeveral Places of Scripture very impertinently quoted, wretchedly applied, and very unbecoming Pope *Innocent*. Nay, they pretend to quote Texts that never were in Being: For Inſtance; *The Prieſts took their annual Turn of Dwelling in the Temple, that they might be pure from all Filth whilſt they attended the Divine Myſteries.* But there is no ſuch Text or Paſſage in the Bible. What impious Wretches are theſe, that dare profane theſe Holy Writings, by intruding their own vile Inventions and lewd Contaminations among them? Again, we find it thus written in the Goſpel: *He that putteth away his Wife, and marrieth another, committeth Adultery; and he that marrieth her that is put away committeth Adultery.* But this is falſe, for the Text is attended with an Exception; *He that putteth away his Wife, except for Fornication.* In this Epiſtle they produce ſome Texts to prove, *That they that live with their Wives ought not to be admitted to miniſter at the Altar.* The firſt is from *Levit.* 11. *Be ye holy, as I am holy.* The next is that of St. *Paul* to *Titus*, *c.* 1. *To the pure all things are pure, but to the defiled and unbelieving nothing is pure.* Surely, People may be chaſt in Marriage, and the *Bed undefiled*, or elſe St. *Paul* was very much miſtaken when he ſaid ſo; for would he have call'd it honourable, if he had not believ'd it ſo? *Heb.* 13. 4. But Forgery with theſe People is above genuine Truth; and the infallible Succeſſor of St. *Peter* is to be believed before his Predeceſſor. What

ſtrange

strange Delusion do People labour under, who will suffer themselves to be thus impos'd on? Surely, without Injury or Affront to a Sacred Text, these People may be said still to walk in Darkness, that can blindly swallow such gross Falshood.

The Epistle to the Council of *Carthage*, which is the 25th, is quoted by *Bellarmine, de Lib. Arb. l.* 3. *c.* 25. to prove Free-will. By *Canus, Loc. Com. l.* 6. *c.* 4, & 8. to prove, *That the Apostolick See is to be in all extraordinary Occasions consulted*; and, *That the Bishop of* Rome *is St.* Peter's *Successor.* But this Epistle, *Erasmus*, in his *Censur. in Ep.* 91. *inter Ep. Aug.* says, *wants both the Style and Genius of so great a Prelate.*

The 26th Epistle, to the Council of *Miletum* in *Afric*, is quoted by *Bellarmine* again to prove Free-will; and that young Children dying unbaptized were damn'd. And this Epistle is undoubtedly his to whom it is ascrib'd, says *Bellarmine, de amiss. grat. l.* 6. *c.* 2. & *de grat. l.* 5. *c.* 26. But, soft and fair! for *Erasmus*, who set a Mark upon the former Epistle, does not let this pass uncorrected; for he says 'tis done by the same Hand; and not without Reason, for it is dated with the Consuls *Honorius* and *Constantius*; when, according to *Marianus, Onuphrius*, and others, *Innocent* died the Year before, when *Theodosius* and *Palladius* were Consuls.

There is an Epistle extant under the Name of *Innocent* to the Emperor *Arcadius*, which, as notorious a Forgery as it is, is quoted by *Alan, Contr. Instit. Brit. c.*5. and *Bellarmine, de Rom. Pont. c.*19. *l.*2. to prove, That Pope *Innocent* excommunicated *Arcadius* and his Wife *Eudoxia.* This, by the way, is to shew their Supremacy over Kings, (not but that Kings have too often incurr'd and deserv'd the Censure of the Church.) But the First that ever took Notice of this, was one *Nicephorus Calistus, Hist. l.* 13. *c.* 34.

c. 34. a modern Writer, and, as his Adversaries call him, a most abominable Lyar. But the very Epistle betrays it self; for it is said in it, that *Eudoxia* was alive after the Death of *John Chrysostome*; whereas 'tis plain from *Socrates*, *l.* 6. *c.* 19, 20, 21. and *Sozomen*, *l.* 8. *c* 27, 28. that *Eudoxia* died three Years before *Chrysostome*, which our Bishop *Bilson* likewise well remembers, *de Primat. Regio*, *par.* 1. *Venericus Vercellensis*, speaking of this Matter, says, *It is uncertain whence this Epistle is taken; but it is most certain, that it is not to be found among the Acts of the Popes, where Pope* Innocent's *are particularly recorded, nor in the Book of his Decrees, nor in the Tripartite History, where more is to be found of the Sentence of Deposition than elsewhere. De Unitate Eccles. conserv. l.* 2.

[417.] The *Pontifical*, as it had done before in others, so in the Life of Pope *Zosimus*, lays a Foundation for several Fictions. For from hence they pretend the Use of the *Pall*, and that ridiculous Custom of consecrating the *Paschal* Wax Taper. *Binius*, in his Notes upon the Life of this Pope, highly applauds him for the Sentence of Excommunication pronounced against *Celestius* the Heretick. But yet *Binius*'s Notes upon the Third Epistle of *Zosimus*, seem to condemn the severe Discipline of the *African* Church against Hereticks, *Labb. T.* 2. *p.* 1560. owning that *Celestius* had been condemned by the *African* Bishops before, but very unfairly infer from thence, that he had appealed to the *Apostolick* See for Justice. But what greater Blot could be cast upon the *Roman* Church, and the *Infallibility* of the *Supream Judge*, than that he should attempt the Reconciliation of a Heretick synodically condemned by another Church? Which is plain from the foresaid Notes, and which the Canons of several ancient Councils had before forbid. This is plain from a Council held at *Carthage*,

thage, *A. D.* 418. in which they again condemn'd the Heresy of *Pelagius* and *Celestius*, making many excellent Canons against such heretical Opinions, and which they sent to Pope *Zosimus* (not to be confirm'd by him) with Letters, wherein they sharply reprove him for his Credulity and Easiness in the Reconciliation of *Celestius*. And truly his Easiness may proceed from his Ignorance, which the foresaid Notes seem to confirm in these Words: Celestius, *the better to conceal his Heresy, drew up a Confession of his Faith so artfully, that* Zosimus *could not avoid being imposed upon by him. Ibid.* And *Labbé*, in his Observation annex'd to these Notes, ingenuously confesses, *That there are many Instances in St.* Augustine, *which plainly shew how Pope* Zosimus *was over-reach'd by that cunning Heretick* Celestius. *Ibid.*

This Pope sat one Year and two Months, in which Time he is said to have written 13 Epistles; which indeed, contrary to the former, are dated under Eight Consuls. But there are many Things which smell strong of Forgery in them. The First Epistle to *Hesychius*, desiring a Copy of the Decrees, speaks lofty of the Authority of the *Roman* See, *which alone can supply the Defects of Power in other Bishops.* The Third Epistle is worth observing, for *Zosimus* declares *Celestius a good Catholick, and that he had from the Beginning a peculiar Respect for the See of* Rome. Very likely truly! Considering the Trick he had put upon the *Infallible* Judge. In his Fourth Epistle *Zosimus* writes in Favour of *Pelagius*, saying, *he seem'd to be a Catholick.* Upon which *Binius* thus notes: Pelagius *and* Celestius, *both tinc'd with the same Heresy, used the same subtil Way of deceiving the Apostolick See. Labb. T.* 2. *p.* 1563.

In the Margin to the Fifth Epistle of this Pope, *Labbé* observes, That the ancient Copy in the *Pa-*

latine Library makes this Epiſtle to be Pope *Sylveſter's*, and calls it an *Apoſtolick* Conſtitution But this Jargon is no new Thing among the Editors and Collectors of the Councils, who make no Scruple whom they father their Forgeries upon, ſo they do but anſwer ſome End.

The Tenth Epiſtle to the Council of *Carthage* is very improbable; for it is not likely the Pope ſhould ſo ſtrenuouſly aſſert the Power of the *Apoſtolick* See, which at this very Time not only ſlighted him, but in their Letters chid him ſeverely for his Eaſineſs in being reconciled ſo haſtily to Hereticks. *Vid. ſupra.*

The 13th Epiſtle is a downright Forgery, talking big of Supremacy, *&c.* to *Greek* Biſhops, who never own'd any Submiſſion to the See of *Rome.* But *Labbe*, in the Margin to this Epiſtle, *To.* 2. *p.* 1574. puts the Matter out of Diſpute in theſe Words, *The Difference of Style makes this Epiſtle look ſuſpicious; and beſides, it is faulty in ſeveral Places.*

[418.] *Boniface* I. is the next in the Catalogue of the *Roman* Biſhops; and notwithſtanding the Infallibility of the Papal Chair, *Eulalius* the Archdeacon was his Competitor and Antipope; which occaſioned a Schiſm, and no ſmall Diſturbance in the *Roman* Church. The Year following, at the Command of the Emperor *Honorius*, a Council was called at *Ravenna*, in which the Controverſy between *Boniface* and *Eulalius* was diſcuſs'd. From whence it is plain the Emperors were the Perſons who had the Power of calling Councils to determine Matters of great Moment. This *Boniface's* Firſt Epiſtle to the Emperor confirms, (which, together with the Anſwer, look like genuine) for it is all the Way ſupplicatory, begging the Emperor's Aid againſt irregular Elections; to which the Emperor gave an Anſwer becoming his Piety. And here

here it may be obſerved, That where we meet with genuine Epiſtles, they carry in them a quite different Air and Strain of Humility than the forg'd ones do. Not only this Epiſtle of *Boniface*'s to the Emperor, but all his other Epiſtles to his Brother Biſhops, are written in a meek Style; no bullying, or aſſerting the Supremacy of the *Roman* Pontiff, but piouſly exhorting to *Brotherly Love and Chriſtian Charity*.

[423.] To put an End to the old Controverſy, the *African* Biſhops write to *Celeſtine*, now Biſhop of *Rome*, defending the Rights of their Church againſt all Appeals to the *Papal* See, (which they call in plain Words, *The impious Refuge of the Clergy*) aud ſharply reprehend the *Roman* Prelates for their arrogant Preſumption in claiming more Power in the Church of Chriſt than of Right belonged to them. *Celeſtine*, about the ſame Time, compliments *Neſtorius* upon his Promotion to the See of *Conſtantinople*, who at that Time did but pretend to be a Catholick. But this *Celeſtine*'s *infallible Opticks* could not ſee into. And therefore *Neſtorius*, well knowing the Advantage of gaining over to his Party the Biſhop of the Firſt See, and finding the blind Side of the *Infallible Judge*, attacks him with ſuch ſpecious Arguments and Perſwaſions, that if he had not been kept upright by his Neighbours, who knew more of the Matter than himſelf, he might, as ſeveral of his Infallible Predeceſſors, have turn'd Heretick, and *brought the Catholick Church in Danger*, as the Editors ſay by *Liberius*, upon his frequent Apoſtatizing.

But *Celeſtine* being inform'd by *Cyril*, of *Neſtorius*'s Treachery, *A. D.* 430. at *Rome*, calls a Council, in which he condemns his old Friend *Neſtorius*'s Hereſy, and by Letters threatens to excommuni-

cate

cate him from the Church of *Rome*, unless within Ten Days he openly renounc'd his Error.

[431.] *Celestine* sends Legates to the Council of *Ephesus*, to push on the Condemnation of *Nestorius*; and the Year after he congratulates the Fathers at *Ephesus* for their Proceedings against *Nestorius*; and at the same Time writes communicatory Letters to *Maximian*, who was chosen in *Nestorius*'s Room.

As for the Epistles which are extant in this Pope's Name, they are, according to the Editors, Fourteen in Number, *Labb. T.* 2. *p.* 1611. whereof Five are in *Greek*, among the Acts of the Council of *Ephesus*. The First Epistle is cited by *Bellarmine* for *Exorcism in Baptism*, *de Bapt. c.* 25. *For Free-Will in Morals*, *de Grat. & lib. Arb. l.* 5. *c.* 26. *And for the Merit of Works*, *de Justif. l.* 5. *c.* 4. But says *Crab*, in the Margin to the Notes on this Epistle, *The last Eleven Chapters of this Epistle seem to be composed by some other Hand than* Celestine's. And to be plain, there is great Reason to think some Body like *Bellarmine* had a Hand in it; for the very Testimonies which he produces are here to be found. But that there is a Cheat is most certain, nor is it much Matter who was the Author of it; let 'em take it among 'em.

Nicephorus, *l.* 14. *c.* 39. pretends to recollect Three other Epistles; *viz.* to *Cyril*, *John* of *Antiochia*, and *Rufus* of *Thessalonica*, in which he seems to approve of the Translation of *Proclus* from the See of *Cyzicene* to that of *Constantinople*. But this could not be, for this Translation of *Proclus* was not till two Years after the Death of *Celestine*. From whence we may fairly conclude these Epistles are not genuine. Nor is that Book *de Secretis*, which is ascrib'd to *Celestine*, of better Reputation, of which *Nicephorus*, in the Place afore-cited, adds two Frag-

 ments

ments. But this was certainly patch'd up by some Friend of the Pontificate about the Time of the Controversies between the *Greek* and *Roman* Churches.

[432.] *Sixtus* the Third, before he was chosen Pope, was accused of *Pelagianism*, but falsly; which unjust Calumny made him a bitter Enemy to that Heresy, and caused him to write a Book against it. After he was Pope, he did many good and publick Acts; such as, the Defence of the Council of *Ephesus*, his reconciling the *Eastern* Church and the *Egyptians*, which he left no Means unattempted to perfect; his Christian Care by Letters to *Nestorius*, then in Banishment in the Monastery of *Eutrepius*, inviting him to return to the Catholick Faith; and at the End of his *Pontificate*, his truly Christian Valour in expelling *Julian* and other Ringleaders of the *Nestorian* Heresy from the Communion of the Church. Now, any Man would reasonably suppose, that the great Character of this good Man, and his pious Acts, were Applause enough to be left to Posterity. But perhaps they think, the Piety of this Pope would screen Abundance of Follies in others, or perhaps better carry on a Cheat. This is indeed a Sort of murdering the Dead, and stigmatizing their Reputation as long as Time shall endure. But this will be as long as there are such Men in the World. There is an Epistle under this Pope's Name to the *Eastern* Bishops, which is cited by *Bellarmine*, *de Concil. l.* 1. *c.* 12. to prove, That *Councils ought to be called by none but the Bishop of* Rome. But this Epistle is spurious, for Two Reasons; First, because the greatest Part of it is taken out of *Fabian*'s Epistle to *Hilarius*, which hath already been proved suppositious. Secondly, because it is dated in the Consulship of *Valentinian* and *Florentius*

rentius, who never were Consuls all the Time of *Sixtus* the Third.

The Acts of *Sixtus* the Third, which are cited by *Bellarmine*, to prove, That the Bishop of *Rome* might depose *Polychronius* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, are fictitious, *which any Man of common Prudence may see by the Date of the Consuls, the Name of the Person accused, and other Things describ'd in these Acts*, says *Binius*, and much more to the same Purpose, which he takes out of *Baronius*, *An.* 433. *n.* 36, 37, and 38. Thus, to serve particular Ends, good Popes must be made the Authors of bad Things; and wicked Popes, tho' Hereticks, must appear Saints in some forged Epistle or Treatise.

[440.] *Leo* I. sirnamed the Great, succeeded Pope *Sixtus* III. about whom the *Pontifical* and other Authors cannot agree: The *Pontifical* (which is seldom right) calls him a *Tuscan*, others a *Roman*. But this is a small Matter with them. Before *Leo* was chosen Pope, (and truly some Time after) he behaved himself so, as first to deserve, and after become that great Post in which he was invested. He was not only a strenuous Champion against the *Nestorian* Hereticks before he was Pope, but after; and not only acted against them in Person, but incited others; as appears by *Cassian*'s Epistle to him, who wrote VII. Books *de Incarnatione Dei*, in Answer to the *Nestorians*, and dedicated them to *Leo*, at that Time only a Deacon. He likewise, by Order of Pope *Sixtus* III. undertook the reconciling the two Generals *Etius* and *Albinus*, which he happily performed. During which Legation, *Sixtus* dies, and *Leo* is chosen in his Room by a general Consent. This was a Time when both Church and State had put on a most melancholy Aspect. For the Incursions of barbarous Nations, and the Deluge of *Nestorian*, *Pelagian*, and *Arian* Hereticks,

 had

had in a Manner defac'd Religion and Humanity. Notwithstanding which, *Leo* undauntedly pursues his high Office, being wanting in nothing that might be for the Honour or Service of the Church. The first Instance of his Zeal was shewn against the *Manichees*, who coming from *Afric*, skulk'd at *Rome* under Colour of Catholicks, and at the Communion would take the *Bread*, but not the *Cup*. [By the Way, it is worth observing, That the Cup not being denied in those Times to the Laity, the denying it now looks like an ugly Innovation.] This *Leo* warn'd the People of, as appears in his 4th Sermon upon Lent, *p.* 217. wherein he calls the *Manichees*'s declining the Cup (which he calls in this Sermon the Blood of our Redemption) a *Sacrilegious Hypocrisy*, which ought to be expell'd the Church. It's plain therefore, that at this Time the Faithful received the Eucharist in both Kinds, and that they who did otherwise, were branded with the infamous Note of Heresy. *Cav. Hist. Lit.* 342.

Thus far I think no *Romanist* but will commend, rather than blame me, for any Thing I have said of this Pope. And truly, as may be said of many others, abstract the Pope from the Man, we shall find him afterwards doing very good Things. But hitherto, I am sure, I have made *Leo* an honester Man than the Editors do, who by palming their ridiculous Fables upon him, vilify and destroy his Character.

About the Year 448, *Eutyches* the Heretick, not as yet known to be such in the *West*, by Letters crept into Favour with *Leo*. Upon which *Leo* wrote both to the Emperor and to *Flavian* in his Behalf; (another Rub upon the Infallibility) by whom being better inform'd, he condemned the Heretick, and wrote a long and learned Epistle to *Flavian* against *Eutyches* and his Errors. The Year following, he

he sent his Legates to the Council at *Ephesus* called *Latrocinale*; from whence, as soon as he understood that all Things were carried there by Fraud and Violence in Favour of *Eutyches*, by *Dioscorus*, he calls a Synod at *Rome*, in which he rescinds the Acts of the Council of *Ephesus*, and condemns *Eutyches*. In return for which, *Dioscorus*, in Conjunction with Ten *Metropolitans*, excommunicates *Leo*. To appease these Tumults, which daily increas'd, a General Council is resolv'd on, which *Leo* labour'd, both with the Emperor and Empress, to have in *Italy*; but could not obtain it: Wherefore it was called at *Chalcedon*, *A. D.* 451. whether *Leo* sent *Paschasianus* and *Lucentius*, Bishops, and *Boniface*, Presbyter, his Legates; who strove with all their Might to have *Leo*'s Epistle to *Flavian*, written two Years before, inserted in the Form of Faith defin'd in this Council. But the Fathers answer'd, They were ready to confirm the foresaid Epistle by their Subscription, but could not admit it to be interwoven with the Synodical Decrees. And when the Legates insisted still upon their Demand, and that the Emperor urg'd the same, the Bishops unanimously cried, *They who contradict this, let them go to* Rome. From this it plainly appears, that *Leo* had a Design upon this Synod, and instead of acting the good Man, he play'd the Part of the cunning One, for by getting his Letter to *Flavian* recorded among the Acts of this Council, they should seem to receive their Sanction from him. To prevent which, the Fathers insist upon the Rights of Councils; and, though the Emperor seemed to favour the Pope's Interest in this Thing, (not suspecting the Bishop of *Rome*'s Design, which soon after shew'd it self) yet they resolutely declare against any such Insinuation, and will allow nothing but their own Decrees to be recorded. So jealous

were they of the Encroachments of the *Roman* Prelates; which they, no Doubt, had Reason at that Time to suspect, not only from the aforesaid exorbitant Demand, but from other Passages, which must needs give them Hints of these clandestine Designs, which soon after appeared. For when they came to compose the Canons, and in the 28th Canon decreed, That the Bishop of *Constantinople* should enjoy the same Privileges and Honours which the Bishop of *Rome* did, the Legates could not contain themselves, but openly declared, *It was a Violation of the* Nicene *Canons, and that they could not consent to any Thing that derogated from the Honour of the Church of* Rome, *or that diminish'd the Power of the* Apostolick *See, and that this was expressly commanded them by* Leo *in their Deputation.* Here's the Secret out, their Errand was to enlarge the Pontificate, and to lose nothing of its Attributes or Prerogative. Nevertheless, the Council proceeded, and pass'd this and the rest of the Canons, the Emperor's Deputies assenting to and confirming them. Which *Leo* hearing, it put him so out of Temper, that he could not forbear Railing; but particularly at *Anatolius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, whom he treats very scurvily, and was never after Friends with. However he subscrib'd to the Confession of Faith here agreed upon, but would not allow the foresaid Decree.

It is worth observing, That the last Three Canons of this Council, as repugnant to the Practice of the Court and Church of *Rome*, are rejected by most of the Editors, particularly *Crabb. Longus a Cor. Joan. Antioch. Dionys. Exiguus*, and *Cabbasutius*, who strenuously decries their Validity.

Amongst the great Number of Epistles ascrib'd to this Pope, that which is called the 69th, and said to be written to *Victurius* and *Eustochius*, is falsly at-

attributed to *Leo*. This *Labbé* plainly makes appear from *Sirmondus*'s Notes. *The Name of* Leo, says he, *hath induc'd most Men to believe that it was Pope* Leo's, *whereas indeed it was written by* Leo Biturcensis.

[461.] Pope *Hilarius* comes next. He, with Bishop *Julian*, and *Renatus*, Presbyter, were Legates from *Leo* to the Council of *Ephesus* in 449. His First Epistle, which he wrote when he was only Deacon of the Church of *Rome* to the Empress *Pulcheria*, does ill agree with those he wrote afterwards to the Bishops of *Arragon*; for in that to *Pulcheria*, he complains of the unjust Sentence against *Flavian*; and tho' he was the Pope's Representative in that Council, yet he does not here, as in those to the Bishops aforesaid, dare to assert the *Infallibility* and *Supremacy*.

[467.] The Papacy of *Simplicius* is infamous for the malicious Persecution of *Acacius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, who, because he would not recede from his Right of equal Power and Honour, decreed by the Council of *Chalcedon*, suffered much from *Simplicius*.

The Notes on *Simplicius*'s First Epistle, tell a most notorious Untruth, and which the meanest Capacity is able to contradict, that ever knew any Thing of Sacred Antiquity. After *Simplicius* had made *Zeno* Bishop of *Sevil* Apostolick Vicar, the Notes add, *It is to be observ'd, that as in this Place* Zeno *was constituted Vicar of the* Spanish *Churches, so* Acacius *Bishop of* Constantinople *was delegated to govern the* Eastern *Churches*. It is hardly to be believed, that one Patriarch should accept of a Deputation from another; especially, when in a General Council, confirm'd by the Emperor, they were both declared equal; but it is more incredible, if we consider the foresaid Difference between

these two Patriarchs, and which on the Pope's Side was for Supremacy only. But this is like *Binius*, who seldom speaks a true Thing, or does a fair One.

[483.] Pope *Felix* succeeds *Simplicius* in his Papacy, and Malice too; for at the Complaint of one *Talaia*, he sent Legates to *Constantinople* in the Case of *Acacius*, which Legation drop'd to nothing; but the next Year calling a Synod at *Rome*, he condemns and excommunicates *Acacius*; but defers the Publication of the Sentence for some Time; till fresh Troubles breaking out upon the Account of *Acacius*'s deposing *Calendion* of *Antioch*, the latter End of the same Year he calls another Synod at *Rome*, and repeats the Sentence; which *Acacius* so lightly valued, that he expung'd *Felix*'s Name out of the *Dyptichs*, or Sacred *Register of the Church*, according to *Nicephorus*, *l.* 16. *c.* 17.

The First Epistle of this Pope is quoted by *Canus*, *Loc. Com. p.* 196. to prove, That the Hereticks expung'd several Canons out of the Council of *Nice*. And by *Stapleton*, *Relect. Controv.* 3. *q.* 7. to prove, That all Appeals ought to be made to the See of *Rome*. But this Epistle is dated under the Consulship of *Agarius* and *Julian*, who are not mentioned by any Chronologer whatever. Besides, as *Peter Crab* observes in his Annotation on this Epistle, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 362. the latter Part of this Epistle is taken *verbatim* out of the Epistle of Pope *Felix* I. to the Bishops of *Gaul*.

[492.] *Gelasius*, an *African* by Nation, and a very learned Man, is this Year advanc'd to the Pontifical Chair; and is immediately complimented by *Euphemius* with communicatory Orthodox Letters, which *Gelasius* owns, but declines an Answer, till *Euphemius* had expung'd *Acacius*'s Name out of the *Dyptichs*; which *Euphemius* positively refuses,

fuſes, proteſting againſt the unjuſt Sentence pronounc'd againſt *Acacius*. *Gelaſius* perſiſts in the Defence of his Predeceſſor's Proceedings, which he endeavours to defend by many and long Epiſtles to *Euphemius*, and the Emperor *Anaſtaſius*, and as long as he lived, denied Communion with *Euphemius* and all his Adherents.

Thus from *Leo*, who was the firſt Pretender to or Inſinuator of the *Supremacy*, the ſucceeding Biſhops of *Rome* carry on the Claim of an Univerſal Power; which in that very Time the *Greek* and *African* Churches were far from acknowledging.

In this Pontificate, the *Manichees* in *Rome* skreen'd themſelves under the Mask of *Catholiciſm*; but, to give this Pope his Due, he ſoon diſcovered and routed them; for, by a Decree, he declared thoſe Perſons Hereticks who did not communicate in both Kinds. Upon which he condemn'd and baniſh'd them the City. Nor did he ſhew himſelf leſs ſevere againſt the *Pelagians* and *Eutychians*, as Occaſion offer'd, either in Writing or Authority. What was ſaid of *Leo the Great*, may truly be ſaid of this Prelate, That they were pious, learned, eloquent, prudent, vigilant in their paſtoral Care, zealous againſt Hereticks, ſteady in Point of Faith, ſtrenuous Aſſerters of the Pontificate, as appears in *Leo* againſt the General Council of *Chalcedon*, and in both in the Caſe of *Acacius*, whoſe Right of equal Honour and Power was the ſame with the Biſhops of *Rome*, as founded upon the ſame Authority.

That moſt famous Decree, ſaid to be this Pope's, about the Canonical Books of Scripture, and which is almoſt in every Hand, cannot be his for ſeveral Reaſons, ſays Doctor *Cave*, *Par.* 1. *p.* 374. 1. The ancient Books aſcrib'd it to no certain Author; for *Baluzius*, in his Notes upon *Gratian*, *p.* 44.

tells

tells us, It is by some attributed to *Damasus*, by some to *Gelasius*, and by others to *Hormisda*; which is a certain Sign that the Author of it is unknown. 2. There are Books cited in this Decree, *A. D.* 494. either not yet written, or never heard of. 3. There are many Absurdities and Inconsistencies in it, unbecoming the Judgment of *Gelasius*, or the Synod. 4. It condemns the Apostolick Canons, which *Dionysius Exiguus*, who greatly valued *Gelasius*'s Memory, quickly after turn'd into *Latin*, without any Scruple of their Authority, and which the Church of *Rome* received and practised as a most exact Rule for Ecclesiastick Discipline; which She would never have done, had they been rejected or condemned by *Gelasius*. To confirm which, Bishop *Pearson*, in his Vindication of *Ignatius*, *par.* 1. *c.* 4. shews us, That *Gelasius* admitted the Apostolick Canons, and in his Decretal Epistles seems to approve the Use of them. 5. The Author of this Decree pretends to agree with St. *Hierome* in all Things, *We are of the same Opinion with St.* Hierome. But he is diametrically opposite to St. *Hierome*, about the Canon of Scripture, calling *Tertullian*, *Pastor*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *&c.* Apocryphal, and forbidding them to be read by Catholicks, which Authors he highly applauds, and recommends to be read. Finally, no Body before the Year 840 mentions any Thing of this Decree, either in History or Controversy. And it is scarcely to be suppos'd, That *Dyonysius Exiguus*, who lived much about that Time, was a great Admirer of this Pope, and not long after his Death collected the Decrees of the *Roman* Prelates, and amongst these the Decrees of *Gelasius*, bearing Date the same Year, should omit such a Decree as this.

Now

Now this Decree being plainly proved ſuppoſitious, I cannot imagine for what End the Author of it ſhould impoſe it upon the World, except, by Way of Inſinuation, to introduce an unlimited Power of Directing, Contradicting, Doing, Undoing, and at the ſame Time oblige Mankind to think and believe, That this *Infallible Judge* cannot err, tho' his Actions are meer Frenzy, and his Decrees a Series of Contrarieties.

But when any Thing, tho' never ſo bright and valuable, appears under the Name of any Pope, if it interferes with their modern Principles and Practice, down it muſt, rather than the *Epheſians* loſe their *Great Diana.* A very foul Inſtance of this we have in that incomparable Treatiſe of this Pope's *againſt Eutyches* and *Neſtorius, concerning the Two Nature's of Chriſt. Labb. T.* 4. *p.* 1157, *&c.* In which Treatiſe, *Gelaſius* produces the ſtrongeſt Argument againſt the *Tranſubſtantiating the Euchariſtical Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, that may be. For which Reaſon, *Baronius, Bellarmine, Gregory de Valentia, Suarez*, and others, will not allow this Treatiſe to be Pope *Gelaſius's*; but ſome aſcribe it to *Gelaſius Cyzizenus*, others to *Gelaſius* of *Cæſarea*: But Truth will prevail. *Gennadius, de Script. c.* 94. mentions it. *Fulgentius, l. de* 5 *Queſtion. apud Ferrandum diac. c.* 18. and Pope *John* II. in his Epiſtle to *Avicenus*, quotes this very Treatiſe of *Gelaſius*; and *Anaſtaſius*, the Abbot and Librarian at *Rome*, towards the End of the Ninth Century, aſcribes this Book to *Gelaſius. Lab. T.* 4. *p.* 1054. *Lib. Pont. in Vit. Gelaſ.* Nay, ſo great is the Force of Truth, that *Labbé, T.* 1. *p.* 342. *Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ.* offers very good Reaſons for this Book's being *Gelaſius's*. I muſt confeſs, I ſhould have ſome Charity for ſeveral of the *Roman* Editors, for the Sake of their ingenuous Dealing in Caſes of Forgery, provided

they

they did not afterwards make that base Use of them, to serve a Turn in confirming one Forgery by another. I should allow their Way of exposing Cheats to publick View, with their honest marginal Hints, to caution the unwary Reader against Frauds. Among these I reckon *Peter Crab*, one of the honestest; *Labbé* and *Cassart* next; and *Baronius* after them: But not those abominable Parasites of the *Pontificate*, *Bellarmine*, hot-headed *Binius*, fulsome, impertinent and trifling *Longus a Coriolano*. But when I find them perverting the Good, and disowning the Truth and genuine Works of their most learned and pious Bishops, I cannot but with Horror look upon them as a Generation of Vipers, who would gnaw their Way through the Bowels of their Mother the Church, and her Primitive Doctrines, to support their ambitious Practices; and by Impostures persuade the World, that their late Whimsies and Fopperies were the Discipline of the earliest Times of Christianity.

[496.] *Anastasius* is no sooner promoted to the Papal Dignity, but interests himself in the old Quarrel between *Leo* and *Acacius*, insisting to have his Name expung'd the *Diptychs*; but he might as well have kept his Legates at home, for the Emperor *Anastasius* assures his Namesake the Pope, that he will resolutely defend the Cause of *Acacius*. *Vid. Vales. notas in Theodori Lectoris collect. l. 2. p. 560.* In the Midst of which Pope *Anastasius* dies; upon which a Schism commences, and an Antipope arises, by the Name of *Laurentius*. But before we leave *Anastasius*, let us see what the *Pontifical* says of him: Which, with *Platina*, (who is upon Occasion much beholden to this Book) tells us, *'Tis plain, that many Presbyters and Clergy of the Church of* Rome *had withdrawn themselves from the Communion of* Anastasius, because he had communicated with *Photi-*

Photinus, a Deacon of *Theſſalonica*, who was a great Friend of *Acacius*, and a generous Aſſerter of his Cauſe: And beſides, they were jealous that he underhand had attempted to reſtore *Acacius*'s Name to the *Roman Diptychs*; adding, that Anaſtaſius *was ſtruck by Divine Vengeance*: Which *Platina* explains, by ſaying, *as he was eaſing Nature his Bowels came from him*. This is a very ridiculous Story, and, in my Opinion, no way tending to the Reputation of the *Infallible Judge* for the Time being. Beſides, it is ſo inconſiſtent, that no ſober Man can be induced to credit it: For is it likely that ſo implacable an Enemy to *Acacius* as Pope *Anaſtaſius* ſhew'd himſelf, by reviving an old Quarrel after the Deceaſe of the Two Principals, ſhould communicate with *Photinus*, the *Friend* and *Champion* of *Acacius* and his Cauſe? It is ſo groſs an Abſurdity, that I cannot ſee what End it can anſwer; or if it could pretend to countenance any Thing, the whole Story is ſuch an incoherent Blunder, that no Body can give the leaſt Credit to it.

They talk of Epiſtles, Fragments in *Baluzius*'s Collection, *Books of the Trinity, of Free-will, Rules of Faith againſt the Pelagian Hereſy, and ſeveral Sermons*, which they tell us were loſt. A very fair Riddance truly; and if the reſt of their Trumpery had periſh'd with them, the Chriſtian World had not been ſo much impos'd upon, nor God's true Religion render'd ſo contemptible, as it has been by their ridiculous and fooliſh Legends. But as for the Works of this Pope, we have only *Platina*'s Word for them; nor does it any where appear from whence he has his News. But his and the Pontifical's Credit may go together; and they who believe either of them, are readily ſuſceptible of any Thing, though never ſo groſs.

[498.] The

for in it he compliments King *Lewis*, as newly baptized by *Remigius* Bishop of *Rhemes*: Whereas this *Lewis* (whom he calls *Clodoveus*) was baptized in the Year 496, and died 509, at least 511, which was, by the last Account, Three Years before *Hormisdas* was Pope. Among this Pope's Decrees, is that Decree so much talk'd of in the Life of Pope *Gelasius*.

[523.] Pope *John* I. succeeds *Hormisdas*; who in the Year 525, is sent upon a Message (as Supreme as he was) by *Theodoric* to the Emperor *Justin*, to entreat him not to deprive the *Arians* of their Churches, which he was about to do; (a pretty Errand for an Orthodox Bishop to be sent on!) Whilst he was upon this Embassy at *Constantinople*, he refused to sit by *Epiphanius* the Patriarch; demanding a higher Place or Throne to be erected for him: Which Note of Distinction was so little understood by the *Greek* Church, that he was soon sent packing to *Rome re infectâ*: For which, *Theodoric* sends for him to *Ravenna*, and rewards him with a Prison, where he breathed his last; and deservedly, for going on an Embassy in Behalf of Hereticks.

There are Two Epistles ascrib'd to this Pope: Both which are by all the Editors look'd upon as supposititious. The Date of the first is own'd to be false by *Binius* himself; for *Maximus* and *Olibrius* were never Consuls together, the first serving that Office, *A. D.* 523, and the latter 528. Besides, the former Part of this Epistle is taken out of Pope *Zachary*'s First and Pope *Innocent*'s Second Epistle; but the greatest Part of it, *viz.* from the first fifteen Lines, is stolen from Pope *Eusebius*'s Second Decree. *Labb. T.* 4. *p.* 1604. As to the Second Epistle, it begins the same with *Leo*'s 76th Epistle. And *Gregory* of *Turen*, *l. de Gloria Martyr.*

c. 20. ſeems to be the Fountain from whence the reſt of it came. But that which moſt plainly demonſtrates this Epiſtle not to have been Pope *John*'s, is the Date, which is the 3d of the Ides of *June*; *Maximus* and *Olibrius* being Conſuls; (which cannot be,) for, as has been noted before, theſe Two could never be Conſuls together: And if they will have this Pope the Author of this Epiſtle, he muſt write it after he was dead; for he died the 18th of *May* before: And yet *Binius* has the Confidence to defend theſe Epiſtles as genuine. But few of the Editors are of his Mind; which I ſhould very much commend, did they not foiſt theſe Forgeries into their Collections; for if they are fictitious, What do they there? But truly, their introducing them, though with Cautions that they are ſuſpicious or forg'd, looks as if they were intended for ſomething, and ſtand there to be made Uſe of as Opportunity ſhall offer. And till they are left out, I ſee no Reaſon any Man can have to think well of any of them.

[527.] Pope *John* dying in Priſon, *Felix* is named his Succeſſor by *Theodoric*: Againſt whom *Baronius* exclaims moſt unmercifully, *An.* 526. And truly he has Cauſe; for it looks a little odd for an Heretical Prince (for ſuch, or, at leaſt, a great Patron of them, was *Theodoric*) to chooſe the *Supreme Infallible Judge*. He was reckon'd, they tell us, a very honeſt Man among the *Roman* Clergy: But it had been no Matter for Character; *Baronius* would not have rail'd for that, let his Character have been as black as might be, the Papacy takes off all Note of Infamy. The Perſon nominating him is that which nettles *Baronius*.

The Three Epiſtles aſcribed to him are moſt ſcandalous forgeries; which, if they ſeem but to ſupport any Part of the Papal Authority, (which

 they

they are generally made for) must pass for genuine. Part of the First Epistle is taken out of the 54th and 84th Epistles of *Leo*, *Gregory*'s 36th Epistle, *Innocent*'s 4th Epistle, and *Siricius*'s 4th Epistle. The Second is taken out of *Innocent*'s 13th Epistle, and *Gregory*'s Epistle to *Augustin* and his Companions in *England*, and is in *Bede*, *l.* 1. *c.* 13. and dated the 12th of the Calends of *November*, *Lampadius* and *Orestes* being Consuls; Which Chronology, say *Baronius* and *Binius*, is false; for *Boniface*, and not *Felix*, sate in the Papal Chair the latter End of *October*: But *Labbé* declares the whole Epistle to be a Forgery, *T.* 4. *p.* 1657. The Third Epistle is of the same Piece, as may be seen in the foresaid Places.

[530.] About this Time there had like to have been another Flaw in the Succession; but *Dioscurus* the Antipope dying soon, put an End to it, and left *Boniface* II. in quiet Possession of the Chair; who, to shew his Power, anathematizes dead *Dioscurus*. But poor *Boniface*, it seems, had more Courage to encounter the Dead than the Living: For designing to prevent the *Gothick* Kings from meddling in the Disposing of the Papacy hereafter, he calls a Synod at *Rome*, and appoints *Vigilius* the Deacon his Successor. This, indeed, would have been securing a Succession to some Purpose, tho' most immethodical and uncanonical. But here follows the Trial of *Boniface*'s Courage. No sooner did King *Athalarick* hear of these Matters, but he severely checks Pope *Boniface*, who readily retracts his Decree of Succession, which he burn'd in the Presence of all the Clergy and Senate, and owns himself guilty of Treason. There are very few Instances hitherto in any of these Prelates of *Rome*, that ever shew'd any Steadiness of Temper, especially in the Right.

There

There are Two Epistles charged upon this poor Criminal; which he was as innocent of as any of his Predecessors. The First, to *Eulalius* of *Alexandria*, is an infamous Piece of Imposture; and which *Bellarmine*, whom we may believe in this Case, questions in these Words, *l. 2. de Rom. Pon. c. 25.* Eulalius *of* Alexandria, *to whom* Boniface *seems to write, was not at that Time, if ever, in being: as is plain from* Nicephorus. *Besides,* Boniface *hints in the Epistle, That he wrote to* Justin *the Emperor; but* Justin *was dead before* Boniface *was Pope.* Moreover, this Epistle is for the most Part taken out of Two Fragments, one of which is stolen from *Hormisda*'s Epistle to *John*; the other from St. *Gregory*'s Epistle to the Bishops of *Gaul, l. 4. Ep. 52.* which is very certain, for the Style bespeaks it St. *Gregory*'s; which is likewise *Baronius*'s Thought. As to *Eulalius* of *Alexandria*, *Possevin*, in his *Apparat. Sacr. Verb.* is of the same Opinion with *Baronius*, both agreeing, that there was no such Person at that Time as *Eulalius*, (*Timothy* the Third being then Bishop) nor was there ever before or after such a Person as *Eulalius* in the Catalogue of the *Alexandrian* Bishops.

But besides this we have another undeniable Instance of this Epistle's being suppositious. This Epistle says, That the Church of *Afric*, from the Time of the Sixth Council of *Carthage* to Pope *Boniface* II. (which is an Hundred Years) did not communicate with the Church of *Rome*, by reason of *Zosimus*'s commonitory Epistle, *&c.* But this the Eighth Epistle of Pope *Celestine* to the Bishops of *France* makes to be an apparent Falsity: For in that *Celestine* defends St. *Augustine* against certain Bishops of *France*, who said, St. *Augustine*'s Doctrine about Free-Will was not sound, because it too much lessen'd the Liberty of Man. In Answer to whom,

Celestine writes, "That as for *Augustine*, a Man "ever to be remember'd for his Holiness of Life, "and other Merits, we always look'd upon him to "be in our Communion.

The other Epistle is dated under wrong Consuls, *Lab. T.* 4. *p.* 1683. and consequently false: As is that Profession of Faith pretended to be *Justin's*; for *Binius* and *Baronius* say, That he died Four Years before the Date of it: Besides, it is patch'd up out of *Hormisda's* Epistle to the *Spanish* Bishops, and out of *John's*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, and several others. It is dated in the Third Year of *Justin's* Consulship; but at that Time *John*, and not *Boniface*, presided in the Church of *Rome*.

[532.] *John* II. surnamed *Mercurius*, succeeded *Boniface*. To him Six Epistles are ascribed: The First of which is rejected by *Labbé* and others as spurious.

[535.] *Agapetus* no sooner ascends the Papal Chair, but notably bestirs himself; though he gives the *Infallibility* an unlucky Stroke, by rescinding some of Pope *Boniface's* Acts, and absolving *Dioscurus*, whom *Boniface* had condemned after he was dead. In Truth, considering the Time in which they were both done, the Sentence and Absolution were equally insignificant.

We have no particular Account how this Pope was advanced to the Chair: And I verily believe they designedly drop'd it; for it is scarce to be suppos'd, that the *Gothick* Kings, who had once taken upon them the Nomination of the Bishops to the See of *Rome*, would ever part with it: Nay, we see, that when *Boniface* attempted to resume it from the Temporal Power, *Athalarick* made him recant, and own himself guilty of Treason. Besides, it is very reasonable to believe, that whilst the *Goths* held Part of the *Roman* Empire, they kept

kept this Nomination to the See of *Rome* in their own Hands; and this may fairly be infer'd from the Authority those Princes exercis'd over the Popes. As for Instance, in the Case of *John* I. who was sent on an Errand, and a very scandalous one too, and that in Defence of no less than *Arian* Hereticks, by *Theodoric* to the Emperor *Justin*. This he durst not refuse, but perform'd, tho' without Success; for the Emperor, (much a better Christian than the Pope, would not comply with his Request. Upon which he return'd, and is by his Master *Theodoric* put in Prison, where he died. *Felix*, indeed, they own to be named by *Theodoric*; and I question not but all the rest, during the *Gothick* Government, were nominated by them. O wretched *Supremacy!* O ridiculous *Infallibility!*

What I have said on the Point of the Papal Slavery, is here made good again in the Person of Pope *Agapetus*; for in Spight of the pretended *Supremacy*, *Theodatus* the *Goth* sends him to the Emperor *Justinian* to deprecate his Arms from *Italy*; which his *Infallibility* could not obtain, and, I suppose, dreading the Fate of his Predecessor Pope *John* I. did not care to run the Hazard of a Prison by returning Home, but tarried at *Constantinople*, where he died. Whilst he was here, *Anthimus* Bishop of *Constantinople*, being detected of the *Eutychean* Heresy, was deposed, and *Menna* ordained in his Place.

Of the Seven Epistles said to be his, the Fifth to *Anthimus* is a plain Forgery; as appears, not only by the false Date, but by the Epistle it self: For the Beginning of it is the same with Pope *Hormisda*'s 80th Epistle, and the Body of it is taken out of *Leo* I.'s 97th Epistle. This *Labbe* owns, *T.* 4. *p.* 1795, and, which is much to be wondred at, *Binius* by the Date pretends to discover the Cheat.

[536.] The Life of *Sylverius* is very entertaining, for it affords Variety of Matter. The *Pontifical* foolishly blunders out, That he was the Son of Pope *Hormisda*; which the Editors dare not deny, because the *Pontifical* says it. And therefore *Binius* softens it with a very impertinent Note. *No Doubt but he was legitimate, and born in preceding Wedlock, otherwise he could not have arrived to that Dignity.* The Ambiguity of this Note insinuates an Illegitimacy, and the Word *preceding* is put in with no other Design, but to introduce and countenance their Celibacy after Ordination.

In the next Place, the *Pontifical* casts a foul Suspicion of Simony on *Sylverius*, in these Words: *He was advanc'd to the Papacy by the Tyrant* Theodatus, *without the Deliberation of a Decree. Which* Theodatus *being corrupted with Money, became very terrible to the Clergy; for those who did not consent to this Election were put to the Sword.* Which Words of the *Pontifical*, *Binius*, to colour over with another Meaning, tells us, *There could be no Simony in* Sylverius, *because* Liberatus, *who lived in those Days, remembers nothing of it; besides,* Sylverius, *in a little Book which he wrote about the Condemnation of* Vigilius, *charges him with Simony, which he would not have taken the Freedom to do, had he been guilty of it himself.* This is a wretched Excuse indeed, for as to *Liberatus*'s not taking Notice, I think I may fairly ask this Question, What Historian takes Notice of, or mentions all Occurrencies? Undoubtely, it is to the Variety of Authors that we are obliged for the Acts of Times, one making out another. And as for *Sylverius*'s charging *Vigilius* with Simony, I think it's very preposterous; for *Vigilius* lost the Papacy, and I should think, if there were any Simony in this Case, it were most likely in him that obtain'd the Promotion, not in him that lost it. For in

Case

Cases of this Nature, the highest Bidder generally carries the Point. However let the Simony lie where it will, it's most certain there was Bribery in the Case; only *Binius* will not lay it upon the Pope, (for he must not be thought to err). But suppose *Vigilius* to have been the Person guilty of Simony, tho' he was not then Pope, yet he afterwards obtain'd the Papacy, which ought not to be done, for the 29th Apostolick Canon, the 2d of *Chalcedon*, and many others, depose and excommunicate all *Simoniacks*, who are thereupon uncapable of any further Promotion in the Church. I shall defer the rest of *Sylverius*'s Pontificate till we come to *Vigilius*, his Murderer and Successor, and proceed to this Pope's Epistles, as they call them; the First of which is to *Vigilius*, wherein he accuses him of Ambition and Simony, and pronounces Sentence against him. The other is to one *Amator*, a Bishop. But these must be both false by the Consular Note, for there were no such Persons as *Bellisarius* and *Basilius* Consuls during *Sylverius*'s Pontificate.

[540.] *Vigilius* wades to the Pontifical Throne thro' his Successor's Blood; who, at the Instigation of *Vigilius*, by Command of the *Gothick* King *Theodate*, is deposed by General *Bellisarius*, and banish'd to *Patara*, a City of *Lycia*, where he calls a Synod consisting of a few Friends and Brethren Bishops, and condemns *Vigilius*. At length he is sent back by *Justinian* the Emperor to *Italy*, that his Cause might be fairly and synodically heard; but by the Easiness of *Bellisarius* he is committed to *Vigilius*'s Care, who forthwith transports him to the Island *Palmaria*, where for some Time he lived in a starving Condition, and at last was murder'd by two Assassines sent on that Purpose. And thus *Vigilius* succeeded: But the Divine Justice pursued him;

for he lived to see himself deserted and distress'd, his Actions rendering him so infamous, that the Clergy and People of *Rome* refus'd Communion with him, expung'd his Name out of the Diptychs, and constituted *Pelagius* Pope. The *Africans* call'd a Synod, and excommunicated him the *Catholick* Church, reserving Restitution only upon Repentance. For his prevaricating with *Justinian* the Emperor, tho' he fled to the Altar for Refuge, yet was he rudely torn from thence; then by the Emperor's Command he is drag'd through the City with a Rope about his Neck, and at last thrown into Prison, where he indur'd great Affliction. But before his Death the Emperor and he being reconciled, he came to *Syracuse* in *Sicily*, where the 7th of *May*, 555. he died of the Stone.

Now, considering the many and remarkable Instances of humane Frailty in the Bishops of *Rome*, I think the Champions of that Bishop's Infallibility, of all People, ought to be silent. For I challenge the World to produce, either from Sacred or prophane Story, any one Series, Generation, or Order of Men to this Day, that has been guilty of such Failing, Weakness, Unsteadiness, Cruelty, *&c.* as they have.

[555.] *Pelagius* was forced to clear himself of a Design to murder *Vigilius*, before he could be admitted to the Papacy; which he did, and obtain'd it: But what a sad Time must it be, when none but stigmatiz'd Persons, and with no less Crimes, or Suspicions at least, than those of Murder, should be Candidates for this high Dignity!

The Editors pretend 16 Epistles to be written by this Pope, *Lab. T.* 5. *p.* 788. which they publish with all Assurance imaginable, tho' at the same Time they own the First to be a Forgery, being partly stolen from Pope *Leo*'s 35th Epistle. Besides the

the Date condemns it. And yet this must pass; and in the Front too. Another notorious Instance of this Kind, we have in the Life of

[559.] Pope *John* III. the Successor of *Pelagius*. For tho' *Labbé*, *T.* 5. *p.* 823. in the Margin, ridicules *Binius* about the Epistle of this Pope, affirming that all learned Men looked upon it as spurious. And tho' he plainly tells us this Epistle is taken out of several of S. *Leo*'s, *Innocent*'s, *Gregory*'s, *Zozimus*, *Celestine*, *&c.* and that it is a Cheat of some of *Isidore*'s Disciples, and such as none but Men of weak Judgment would credit; yet, with all this Train of Scandal, it shall be inserted by the Editors; and for these Reasons, (tho' in my Opinion poor ones.) It is cited by *Turrian*, *Pro Epistolis Pont.* *l.* 2. *c.* 10. to prove, That *Linus* and *Cletus* were not Bishops of *Rome*, but Coadjutors to St. *Peter*. It is cited also by *Bellarmine*, *l.* 1. *de Cleric.* *c.* 17. to prove, That the *Chorepiscopi* could do many Things which Bishops did. But, says *Binius*, out of *Baronius*, *An.* 572. *n.* 3. This Epistle was written by some Impostor, after the Death of Pope *John* III. for several Reasons: 1. It is dated under the 6th Consulship of *Justin*, and the 14th of the Calends of *August*, in the 7th Year of *Justin*, and of Christ 572, at which Time Pope *John* III. was dead. 2. It is dated under Consuls, which Custom was then left off, the Office ceasing with *Basilius*, the last Consul. 3. It says, That *Linus* and *Cletus* were Coadjutors, which all Writers of Antiquity can contradict. Besides, the Name *Chorepiscopi*, about whose Office the whole Epistle is written, and to the Bishops of *Gaul* and *Germany*, was at that Time abolish'd in those two Countries.

[573.] When, by Reason of War and Tumults, the See of *Rome* had lain vacant Ten Months and three Days, *Benedictus* was created Pope.

Henry VIII's putting the Priests to Death, which is a very unlucky Blunder, for the subsequent Word, *Militant*, (do march) makes the Matter clear against them: For if they were put to Death, How should they walk up and down? Unless they did as St. *Denis* is said to have done, carried his Head in his Hand. But this Epistle was written to tax the Pride of *John* Bishop of *Constantinople*, who about that Time had taken upon him the Title of *Universal* Bishop. Doctor *James*, *Corrupt. &c.* p. 226, 229, *&c.*

At the End of the 12th Book of Epistles, in St. *Gregory's Privilege*, which he is said to grant to the Monastery of St. *Medrad*. This Privilege you must imagine a choice one, since almost all the Champions of the Pontificate quote it, but especially *Bellarmine*, *de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 19. and *Coster's Apolog. par.* 1. *p.* 65. to prove, *That* POPES *may depose* KINGS. *And whatsoever King, Prelate, Judge, &c. shall violate the Decrees of this Privilege, shall be punish'd with this dreadful Anathema, viz. He shall be deprived of his Honour, and the Converse of Christians, be excluded the Communion of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ*, [By the Way observe, that Communion in both Kinds was still used to the Laity.] *and shall be condemned with* Judas *and all Infidels and Heretics, unless by due Repentance he reconciles himself. Lab. T.* 5. 1584, 1585. What a dreadful Thing is it, to see Mankind so wicked as to introduce an impious Sham with such Solemnity, and prostitute the blessed Body and Blood of our Saviour to their ridiculous Impostures? This very Privilege, and the Anathema attending it, are alike fictitious, as appears from the Subscription; for it is dated the Calends of *June*, A. D. 594. and the Subscribers to it are, *Augustin* Bishop of *Canterbury*, *Mellitus* Bishop of *London*, and *Theodoric* King of *Gaul*: Which can-

cannot be, for *Auguſtin* was not ſent into *England* till 596, neither was *Mellitus* made Biſhop of *London* till 604, nor was *Theodoric* King of *Gaul* till 596. Theſe Circumſtances are undeniably true, and *Baronius* is forced to give up this *Sham Privilege* as a Cheat upon this Conviction. *An.* 593. *n.* 84.

Thus far the Editors are beholden to the *Pontifical* for their Shams and Forgeries, which breaking off here, they muſt depend on their own Ingenuity; which, to give them their Due, is fertil enough upon Occaſion.

[604.] *Sabinian* ſucceeds *Gregory the Great*, to whom, (which is no ſmall Wonder) they aſcribe no Epiſtle nor Decree, except one in a *Roman* Council, *A. D.* 606, about the Election of a Pope.

[614.] Till *Deuſdedit*'s Time they are pretty quiet, in whoſe Pontificate *Labbé*, *in Marg. T.* 5. *p.* 1648. diſcovers a very foul Piece of Impoſture in the Epiſtle pretended to be written by this Pope to *Gordianus* Biſhop of *Sevil* in *Spain*, which carries an apparent Cheat in the very Front of it; for *Iſidore* owns, That he was Biſhop of *Sevil* from the Year 600 to 636, nor did he admit of any Collegue from the Year 614 to 617. Now ſince *Labbe* profeſſes himſelf one of, or the only Diſcoverer of this Forgery, I cannot conceive for what Reaſon he ſhould inſert the Epiſtle, when the Title condemns it; except, as I have mark'd before, to be kept till it ſhall anſwer ſome vile Purpoſe, and then it ſhall be quoted for genuine Truth.

[617.] Upon the Deceaſe of *Deuſdedit*, *Boniface* IV. is choſen Pope, in whoſe Time there is ſomething worth Notice. *Mellitus* being dead, *Juſtus* Biſhop of *Rocheſter* ſucceeds him in the See of *Canterbury*; to whom *Boniface* ſends the *Pall* as a Preſent, with Letters, impowering him to conſecrate Biſhops. Now who could have ſtudied a

greater

greater Abuse upon this Pope, or invented a more ridiculous Story than this? For this was what neither King *Eadbald* nor *Justus* ever desired of him, the ancient Canons of the Church having long before invested every Provincial Bishop with that Power.

[626.] Pope *Honorius* is another remarkable Instance of Frailty in the *Infallible Judge of all Controversies.* For in the Year 633, when *Cyrus* of *Alexandria* had by a synodical Decree confirm'd, that *there was but one Will in Christ*; and that *Sophronius* Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, who was present at *Alexandria*, having disputed the Point, withdrew from the Communion of *Cyrus*; *Sergius* Patriarch of *Constantinople* acquaints *Honorius* with the whole Matter by Letters: Who, in his Answer, approves what *Cyrus* had done, and condemns *Sophronius*, confessing but one *Operating Will* in Christ; pretending to confirm his heretical Opinions by Authority of Holy Scripture and the Fathers; as appears in his Third and Fourth Epistle to *Sergius*. *Lab. T. 5. p.* 1682, 1683. And tho' this is plain from his own Acknowledgment, yet *Labbé*, with an unusual Assurance, in the Margin, *ib.* would seem to take this Scandal off from *Honorius*, by saying, *This is but meanly proved upon him.* And whilst *Binius*, in his Notes upon *Honorius*'s Third Epistle to *Sergius*, by frivolous Arguments, and petty Subterfuges, would wipe off this Scandal, he confirms it from the very Words of the Epistle: *We acknowledge but One Will in our Lord Jesus Christ.* This is most disingenuous Dealing, to pretend to invalidate a Truth by confirming it. But it is only a Design to palliate the Heresy of a Pope by a verbose Amusement, that the People should not see too far into their Failings. So little do these Men value their Reputation, if they can by any Fraud colour their *Infallible Guide*'s Back-

sliding. But this will not pass upon Men of common Understanding, if they look farther, for

[639.] Pope *John* IV. who succeeded *Severinus*, after a Pontificate of two Months, calling a Council *A. D.* 639. condemns *Heraclius's Exposition*, and the *Monothelitick* Heresy. And tho' *Honorius's* lapsing into this Heresy was so very notorious, as appears by his own Confession in the Epistles before cited; yet this Pope *John*, in his *Apology* to the Emperor *Constantine*, defends *Honorius*. But the fore-mentioned Council, which is taken from the *Libellus Synodicus*, and publish'd by the Editors among the Councils, and by them own'd to be an *Orthodox* Council, plainly condemns *Honorius*; for it says in express Words, *That the Thrice Blessed Pope* John *succeeded* Honorius *the* Monothelite. This, I think, is as plain as Demonstration can make any Thing; and such as no Shuffling or Amusement can refute.

[641.] *Theodore*, a *Greek* by Nation, the Year after his Advancement to the Papacy, answers the synodical Epistle of *Paul* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, condemning the *Heraclean Exposition*, demanding a Hearing of *Pyrrhus's* Cause in a Synod, and accusing *Patriarch Paul* of intruding into *Pyrrhus's* See before he was condemned. To which Purpose, he treats with the People of *Constantinople*, and the Bishops who had ordain'd *Paul*. And when *Pyrrhus* return'd from *Africk*, upon his Repentance and Orthodox Confession, he is received into Communion with *Theodore*, who deals with the Emperor *Constans* about restoring him to the See of *Constantinople*. But in the Year 648, calling a Synod at *Rome*, he excommunicates *Paul*, whom he had two Years before condemned, and *Pyrrhus*, who return'd to his old Vomit. A hopeful *Infallibility* indeed, alternatively excommunicating aud restoring!

[649.] Pope

[649.] Pope *Martin*, in his First Year, summons a Council of an Hundred and Five Bishops, called the *Lateran Council*, in which he condemned the Emperor *Constans's* Edict, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, and *Paul*, the *Constantinopolitan* Patriarchs, *Cyrus* of *Alexandria*, *&c.* fortifying the Catholick Doctrine of the Two Wills in Christ with good Canons, and anathematizing the *Monotheletick* Heresy. He was, in short, a Man of great Piety and Zeal for the Catholick Faith, and his Acts in Defence of the Church against its most dangerous Enemies, have recommended his Memory to Posterity. But it fared quite otherwise with his Successor,

[655.] *Vitalianus*, who acted quite different to the Methods and Practice of his pious Predecessor. He was a Man of a most slavish Spirit; for when the Emperor *Constans* came to *Rome*, he received him with the most abject Obsequiousness imaginable, very much unbecoming the Character of the *Roman Pontiff*. And when *Maurus* Bishop of *Ravenna* was excommunicated by *Vitalianus*, because he would not appear at *Rome* upon his Summons, *Maurus* rang just such another Peal in his Holiness's Ears; for to shew how lightly he valued him, he excommunicates *Vitalianus*; and being at the Point of Death, he obliges all the Bishops of his Province by Oath to pay no Acknowledgment to the Bishop of *Rome*. So that to this Time we see, the Power of the Papacy was not grown to that Extent to be thought dangerous, not even to its near Neighbours.

[683.] *Leo* II. a *Sicilian* by Birth, succeeds; whose Life, the very Editors own, affords Variety of *Infamous Matter*. There are extant in his Name Five Epistles, which we will examine with the Observations of the Editors themselves, and others.

The First Epistle, says *Cock, p.* 215. is said to have been sent to the Emperor *Constantine.* This Epistle is questioned by *Baronius, An.* 683. *n.* 13, 14. by *Possevin*, in *Apparat. Sacr. Verb. Leo* 2. and by *Binius*, in his Notes on the Epistles. *Lab T.* 6. *p.* 1245, *& seq.* Yet this Epistle, as false as it is proved to be by the Editors themselves, is quoted by the Champions of the *Pontificate* to prove the *Supremacy. Coccius* cites it in his *Ecclesiastick Hierarchy*, to prove, *That Councils approv'd and confirm'd by the Bishop of* Rome *are of the greatest Authority.*

The Second Epistle, under the Name of *Leo* II. to the Bishops of *Spain*, is cited by *Coccius, To.* 1. *l.* 7. *p.* 865. *de Hierarch. Eccles.* to prove, *That the Bishops of* Rome *did in all Times from the Beginning claim and exercise a Supremacy in all Churches.* But *Possevin, in Apparat. Sac. Verb. Leo* 2. says, *There are some Epistles under the Name of* Leo II. *which want Credit, being supposed to be Counterfeit; such as is that to the Bishops of* Spain. Besides, *Binius*, in his Notes out of *Baronius, Lab. &c. T.* 6. *p.* 1248. says, (and not without Reason) *This Epistle, with the Three following,* Baronius *condemns as spurious, because in every one of them it is affirm'd, That the General Council was finish'd the Ninth Indiction, whereas it is plain it was the Tenth, &c.*

The Third Epistle of this Pope to *Quiricus* is by *Baronius* concluded a Forgery; for there never was any Bishop of *Spain* of that Name except *Quiricus* Bishop of *Toledo*, who dying Seven Years before, was succeeded by *Julian*, who lived in the Time of *Leo* II. and was at the 11th Council of *Toledo. Baron. An.* 683. *n.* 19.

The Fourth Epistle of *Leo* II. is said to be written to the Lord *Gloriosus*, Son of Count *Simplicius.* But *Labbé, T.* 6. *p.* 1249. in the Margin, affirms, The Name of *Simplicius* was not to be found among

the Counts that subscribed to the 11th Council of *Toledo*. And besides, as the same *Labbe* hints in the Place cited, Part of this Epistle is stolen out of *Agatho*'s Epistle.

There is a Passage in the Fifth Epistle, which evidently detects it to be an Imposture; *viz. The most pious and Christian Emperor sent his Imperial Letters to our Predecessor* Agatho, *of Apostolick Memory, &c. Which is apparently false, for the Emperor wrote to Pope* Donus, *and not to Pope* Agatho, *about calling a General Council, and dated his Letters, not the Ninth, but Sixth Indiction.* But *Baronius* puts an End to this at once; for he says, *They cannot be* Leo's *Epistles*, but are counterfeited by some Body in *Leo*'s Name *An.* 683. *n.* 17.

[684] *Benedict* II. a *Roman* by Birth, succeeds *Leo* II. This Pope, if there is any Credit to be given to *Anastasius*, obtained an Edict from the Emperor *Constantine*, whereby the Person elected to the See of *Rome* should forthwith, without waiting for the Emperor's further Orders, be consecrated. But this is not very probable, for the Imperial Authority in the Confirmation of Bishops of *Rome* continued beyond these Times. From these two last Passages the ingenuous Reader will naturally conclude the Dependency of the *Roman Pontificate* on the Emperor in these Times; for they were not confirm'd in the Papacy but by the Emperor's Order. So that hitherto it's plain the Bishops of *Rome* had not assumed to themselves the Civil Power.

Rather than this Pope shall be said to do little, he shall be the supposed Father of two Epistles, which *Baronius* damns at once. For, says he, the Acts of the 14th Council of *Toledo* make these appear to be Cheats. For the latter is the same with *Leo* II.'s to King *Ervigius*. And there is a supposititious Epistle of *Benedict*'s among the Epistles of *Leo* II. I think, the Fifth in Number begins thus: *Since there is but one King, God*, &c.

[685.] Since

[685.] Since Pope *John* V. had written no Epistles, lest he should make no Figure at all, the Editors are resolved to find him some Employment. And therefore, to vary the dull old Custom of Epistles, he shall be supposed to write an *Order* or *Declaration*, which was the Emperor *Justinian*'s, tho' it is tack'd to this Pope. It begins thus: *Having great Care and Concern for the establishing the immaculate Faith of Christ*, &c. This looks more like an Imperial Edict, than a Papal Decree; I mean, not so much for the Sense of it, as for the Manner of it. However, certain it is, this Copy is extant among the Acts of the Third *Constantinopolitan* Council. This *Labbé* and *Cossart* cannot deny: But *Binius*, in his Notes on this *Declaration*, confirms what he would contradict. *This Epistle*, says he, *seems to be suspicious, because there is a Repugnancy in the Date; for at that Time* Agatho *was Pope. Besides, it is not very credible that the Emperor (who was not very Sound in Matters of Faith at that Time, as appears by* Nicholas I.'s *Epistle to the Emperor* Michael) *should be sollicitous for the Preservation of the Acts of the Sixth General Council*, &c. And yet *Binius*, depending solely upon the Credit of *Anastasius*, vindicates this *Declaration*, which he had before condemned, from Forgery and Imposture.

[686.] There being no Epistle or Decree ascribed to Pope *Conon*, *Binius* will not let him pass thus naked; and therefore, in his Notes upon this Pope's Life, he offers a Thing worth Observation. *When* Justinian *the Emperor*, says he, *would not be persuaded to restore to the Apostolick See the Liberty of Choosing the Bishop, he commanded, that no Pope should be created without the Consent of his Viceroy. From whence began that wicked Custom among the Candidates for the Pontificate to bribe the Viceroy.* A very fair Confession truly! And yet this very *Binius* is a strenuous Asserter of the Pope's Innocence in the Case

of *Simony*. But with him Bribery is no Simony, and Gifts and Presents are no Bribery.

[715.] In the Life of Pope *Gregory* II. the Editors pretend to palm upon the World the Original and Use of Holy Images. For this Pope was the first that confirm'd *Image-Worship*; which the Editors seem to strengthen with Abundance of Integrity by Arguments drawn from Holy-Scripture; but very strangely perverse, and most disingenuously applied. Pope *Hadrian* I. a great Stickler for this new Doctrine, in his Epistle to *Charlemaine*, argues thus: *In the Book of* Exodus, ch. 25. *we read, That the Lord spake to* Moses, *saying, Speak unto the Children of* Israel, *that they receive an Offering for me: Of every Man whose Heart giveth it freely, ye shall take the Offering for me. And this is the Offering which ye shall take for me.* And so on to the 18th Verse, *And thou shalt make two Cherubims*, &c. [The other Argument is taken from the 1 *Kings*, c. 6. v. 23. *And within the Oracle he made two Cherubims of Olive-Tree*, &c.] and in Verse 29. *And he carved all the Walls of the House round about with graven Figures of Cherubims, and of Palm Trees, and of graven Flowers within and without*, &c. But *Hadrian* goes on in the same Epistle thus: *Let us consider, beloved Brethren, what* Moses *did at the Command of the Lord, and that wise Prince* Solomon, *when by an express Order from God's own Mouth, he built the House of the Lord. With how pure a Heart and Mind then ought we to worship the Carved Images of Christ our God, his Holy Mother the Virgin* Mary, *the Apostles, and all the Blessed Saints of God, whose propitious Intercession may gain us Forgiveness of Sins?* This is, I think, a Parcel of the most prophane Inferences that the wicked Heart of Man could invent or draw from any Authority; besides, nothing could be ever pitch'd upon so repugnant to the Letter of the Holy

ly Scriptures as they are. The first Argument Pope *Hadrian* uses is nothing to the Purpose; for when God commanded *Moses* and the Children of *Israel to make Cherubs of Gold*, he did not command them to worship them, no more than he did *Solomon*; the Variety of carved Images were for Ornament, not for Worship. Except they will invert and change the Words, (which in their *Latin* Bibles they are expert at, as Dr. *James* well observes) and instead of God's bidding them *Make Cherubims*, to *Worship Cherubims*. They have done as bad as this amounts to, as may plainly be seen in the Variety and Contrariety of the vulgar *Latin* Bibles, in Dr. *James's Corrupt. &c. p.* 272, *&c.* But what a Contradiction do they make God Almighty guilty of in his own Acts, particularly in the Second Commandment? Where in a most solemn Manner, and as a Law to last for ever, he obliges us not to *Worship or fall down before any carved or graven Image*; asserting the Right of Worship to be due only to him. Notwithstanding all this, *Labbé* and *Cossart*, *T.* 6. *p.* 1460, 1461. pretend to shew from many Testimonies, That the Worship of Holy Images was received in the Church very anciently.

In the Year 726, the Emperor *Leo*, to put a Stop to the growing of *Image-Worship*, and to take off the Scandal which it gave the *Mahometans* and *Jews*, prudently called a Council, wherein it was decreed, that Images should be removed out of the Churches, or at least be set higher out of Sight.

This Decree he sends into *Italy* to Pope *Gregory*, to have his Consent and Confirmation of it. Who, instead of complying with the Emperor, this Year, or the next, in a Council at *Rome*, excommunicates the Emperor, condemns all Opposers of *Image-Worship*, justifying it to be agreeable to the Practice of *Christ* and his *Apostles*. (O horrid Impiety and

Blasphemy!) In his Letters circular, he charges the Emperor with the highest Impiety, calls him an Enemy to the Christian Religion, and unworthy of the Empire; forbids every one, upon Pain of the most heavy *Interdict*, to pay any Taxes to him, absolves all People in *Italy* from paying any Allegiance to him, forbids Images to be removed out of Churches, and causes the Emperor, in his Statues, to be most vilely affronted by the Mob. He excommunicates *Paulus Patricius* the Viceroy, who was sent to apprehend and bring him to *Constantinople*; sides with, and calls to his Assistance the *Barbarous* People who were in Possession of *Italy*; and, wherever he finds any Thing belonging to the Emperor, he seizes upon it as lawful Plunder. A very hopeful Son of the Church, and loyal Subject! Not only to fly in the Face of his Sovereign, but to side with Infidels against him, and provoke his Subjects to rebel. These vile Actions the Editors are so far from being asham'd of, that Cardinal *Baronius*, *ad An.* 730, *n.* 5. justifies Pope *Gregory*. *When* Gregory, says he, *could by no Means make the Emperor desist from his Resolution, he look'd upon the Time as come, that the Ax was laid to this unfruitful Tree, and that it called to the Apostolick Authority to cut it down. Which thundering Stroke so rous'd the* Western *Christians, that they immediately revolt from* Leo, *and take Part with the Pope.* (Little thinking how hard he and his pious Successors would ride them.) But *Baronius* goes on: *Thus* Gregory *left a noble Example to Posterity, to teach them not to suffer an heretical Prince in the Church of Christ.* A pious Encomium to be bestow'd upon an Idolater and a Rebel.

But for Fear these boisterous Doings should make *Gregory* look more like a *Bully* than a Pope, they tell us, That this very *Gregory*, hearing *Luitprand* King of the *Lombards* was marching to *Rome*, met him,

him, and by his pious Eloquence so soften'd him, that at St. *Peter*'s Altar he divested himself of all his Royal Apparel, and with them offer'd his very Sword and Crown to the Memory of that Apostle. Here's a Turn! The Scene chang'd in a Moment; the Lion turn'd into a Lamb; and blustring Pope *Gregory* transform'd into a supplicant Bishop. How wretched is the State of those Men that must submit, against their Reason, to these Impostures, or suffer the Censure against Hereticks to pass upon them?

The Editors are in a great Confusion about the Epistles of this Pope; for those Two Epistles, which are in *Greek* and *Latin*, among the Acts of the Second Council of *Nice*, in *Labbe*'s Opinion do not belong to this Pope, but to *Gregory* III. And *Sirmondus* thinks, that the First Epistle, which is to *Boniface* the Archbishop, belongs properly to *Gregory* III. for *Gratian* ascribes it to *Gregory* III. Besides, the Mention made in it of the *Pall* sent to *Boniface*, declares it to be so; for the Author of the Life of *Boniface*, *l.* 1. *c.* 31. affirms the Pall to be sent by *Gregory* III.

Gregory II. having so successfully carried on the Cause of *Image-Worship*, is carefully imitated by his Successor,

[731.] *Gregory* III. who treads in his Steps, and is no less strenuous in it; for he thunders out his *Anathema's* against all Opposers of *Image-Worship*, goes on in withdrawing *Italy* from the Empire of the *Greeks*, and annexes to the Church, in the Name of St. *Peter*, all Demesnes of the Emperor about *Rome*. In the Beginning of his *Pontificate* he sent *Commonitory Letters* to the Emperor *Leo*, about restoring Images to the Churches: But *Gregory* the Presbyter, who was sent on that Errand, not daring to deliver the Letters, return'd *re infectâ*:

For which he is summon'd before a Synod, and with great Difficulty escaped Deposition. However, he is sent again on the same Business to *Constantinople*; but the Emperor stops him by the Way in *Sicily*, takes his Letters from him, and banishes him: Which was no sooner known at *Rome*, but the Pope storms; and calling a Synod, again pouring out his *Anathema's* against the Enemies of *Image-Worship*, publishes a notable Decree in Defence of it. At the same Time he sends from the Synod *Constantine* the *Advocate*, and the Year after *Peter* the *Advocate*, on the same Errand; whom the Emperor rewarded as he had done *Gregory* the *Presbyter*: In the Height of which Dispute Pope *Gregory* dies.

It is here worthy our Consideration, How happy might the Church have been under the Patronage and Protection of several pious Emperors and Kings, if it had not been attacked by its own more immediate Members? But it too often and prophetically has been verified, that her greatest Enemies should be those of her own Houshold. Nor can any Infidel be suppos'd so dangerous an Enemy as a Heretick; for the Church entire cannot fall; the Gates of Hell cannot prevail against her: But when she is divided, she is liable to all Storms and Attempts.

[757.] Pope *Paul* I. was another Friend to the *Image-Worshipers*, and teaz'd the Emperor *Constantine* with frequent Embassies, to persuade him to restore Images to the Churches.

This Pope has a whole Bundle of Epistles, after the usual Custom, laid to him; though there is as little Credit to be given to them as to any of the former: And any one, I believe, will think so, when he finds Ten out of Twelve justly liable to be question'd for their Want of Date: And that which

which adds to the Suſpicion is, that the Eleventh Epiſtle is dated the 40th Year of the Emperor *Conſtantine*; and the 12th, the 41ſt; which was ſeveral Years after Pope *Paul* was dead. Beſides, this *Conſtantine* reign'd but 34 Years: But if it were to go according to the Date of the Epiſtles, one was dated 13, the other 14 Years after Pope *Paul*'s Death. If the Editors had ſtudied to make the Popes ridiculous, they could not have taken a more effectual Method.

[772.] Pope *Hadrian* was a famous Stickler in the old Cauſe of *Image-Worſhip*; which he defends in a long Epiſtle to the Emperor *Conſtantine* and his Mother the Empreſs *Irene*: Which Epiſtle is ſtuff'd with moſt pitiful Argument, fabulous Proofs, and Teſtimonies of the Holy Scriptures and Fathers moſt violently diſtorted, and improperly applied. And at laſt he writes an Epiſtle, or ſmall Book, in Anſwer to *Charlemain*, in Defence of the infamous Second Council of *Nice*: Of which it is neceſſary to take ſome Notice, being held about this ſame Argument, for which the Papiſts ſo much contend; as alſo of that memorable Council of *Frankford*, which condemn'd the Second *Nicene* Council. And of theſe Two Councils no Writer ſpeaks more conciſely and ingenuouſly than our Countryman, Sir *Hen. Spelman*.

" A moſt remarkable, but melancholy Diſpute
" aroſe about this Time in the Church of God;
" which being variouſly controverted in the Eaſt,
" according to the Inclination of the Emperors,
" ſome being againſt *Image-Worſhip*, ſome for it, at
" laſt, by the artful Menage of the Empreſs *Irene*,
" at the Inſtigation of Pope *Hadrian*, the *Image-*
" *Worſhipers* carried their Point; and
" in the Second Council of *Nice* got 788, *al.* 789.
" their Idolatrous Doctrine confirm'd; the Acts of
" which

"which Council were sent from *Constantinople* to "*Charlemain* King of *France*, not as yet Emperor, "which he forthwith sends over into *Britain* to "*Offa* King of the *Mercians*, and his Bishops, to be "observed. This strange Doctrine struck the "Church of *Britain* with Amazement: But *Alcuin* "(the then Glory of the *British* Commonwealth of "Learning) writes an Epistle to *Charlemain*, in "the Name of the Bishops and Kings of *England*; "wherein, by true Authorities drawn from Scrip-"ture and the Fathers, which he dextrously, but "faithfully, applied, he quite confuted and de-"stroyed the new Scheme of Worship; and by "Strength of Reason so prevailed with *Charle-"main*, that in the Year 794, he call'd a Council "at *Frankford*, where, in the Presence of above "300 Bishops, the Decrees of the 2d Council of "*Nice* are condemn'd." *Vid. Spelm. T.* 1. *ad an.* 789.

There is a great Dispute among the Editors about the Priority and Legitimacy too of the Councils about the End of the Eighth Century, which were either for or against the Doctrine of *Image-Worship*. But considering the Insincerity of the *Romanists*, I shall rely upon our own Countrymen, *Alcuin*, *Spelman*, Bishop *Beveridge*, *&c.* whose faithful and ingenuous Dealing in this Point makes the Truth very conspicuous.

In the Year 754, there was a Council held at *Constantinople*, which call'd it self the *Seventh General Council*; which pronounc'd Excommunication against all those who should not receive it as the *Seventh General Council*. And taking the Cause of *Image-Worship* into Consideration, they condemn'd it as abominable; decreeing all Images, of what Matter or Colour soever made, to be cast out of all Christian Churches, and severe Punishments to be

be inflicted upon those who should make or worship any Image, either in Churches or in private Houses; *viz.* if the Person offending was Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, he was to be depos'd; but if a Monk or Layman, to be excommunicated, and be liable to the Punishment of the Imperial Laws, as an Enemy to the Commandment of God, and the Opinion of the Holy Fathers of the Church. Then was the Matter controverted in private, each *Party*, according to the Strength of their Interest, carrying their Point; till (as has been said) in the Second *Nicene* Council the *Image-Worshipers* publickly established their Doctrine: Which did not hold long without Controversy; for the *Frankford* Council decreed directly opposite to it in these Words: *The Question being mov'd about the new Synod which the* Greek *Church had call'd at* Constantinople, *concerning the Worshiping of Images, in which it is decreed, That they who will not pay the same Worship and Adoration to the Images of Saints that they do to the* Deific Trinity, *shall be excommunicated: Which Adoration and Worship, the Holy Fathers assembled, despise and condemn.* Beveridg. Annot. in Con. Nic. 11.

The Editors, indeed, pretend a Decree of the Second Council of *Nice* for deifying of Images; but whatever *Binius* may assert, Bishop *Beveridge* declares he could never find it. But if there had been such a Decree, Pope *Hadrian* was more cunning than to own it; (which shews what a rash hot-headed *Spark* this *Binius* is:) For he softens the Expression, and minces the Matter daintily, by saying, *Far be it from us to deify Images, (as some foolishly prattle;) for it is only Affection and Love toward God and his Saints that we pretend; making Use of Images no otherwise than Holy Books to represent their Memory.* Had the Fathers of the *Frankford* Council known this, they had look'd upon it but a poor

Subter-

Subterfuge, and had notwithstanding condemn'd the Doctrine.

But here follows a fine Fetch of *Binius*, to invalidate and lessen the Proceedings of this Council. *It is a great Question* (says he) *among the most learned Men of that Age, Whether the Second* Nicene *Council was condemn'd by the Fathers of the* Frankford *or not; for some deny it, and others affirm it!* And yet tho he owns, that his Two Oracles, *Baronius* and *Bellarmine*, are of Opinion, That this Council of *Nice* was condemn'd by the *Frankford* Fathers, he has the Impudence to insinuate, That when he considers that the Acts of that Council never came to Light, he does not see how any Thing could be said to be done against *Image-Worship*: Nay, he does not stick to say but that they confirm'd it: And is very busy to make the World believe, that his Two illustrious Cardinals in other Places unsay what they had said before. But he must have lost his Eyes that cannot see into this Cheat; or, if he will not, deserves to forfeit the Use of them.

Undoubtedly they took the Advantage of the Loss of the Acts of the *Frankford*-Council, which so strenuously oppos'd *Image-Worship*; nothing of them remaining but our Countryman *Alcuin*'s excellent Epistle.

In the next Century, the better to promote the Worshiping of Images, and that nothing in Holy Scripture should seem to disagree with the Second *Nicene* Council, the Second Commandment, which forbids the Worshiping of Graven Images, is taken out of the Decalogue; and, to keep up the Number, the Tenth Commandment is divided: *Thou shalt not covet thy Neighbour's House*, supplies the Room of the Ninth; and, *Thou shalt not covet thy Neighbour's Wife, nor his Servant, nor his Maid, nor his*

his Ox, nor his Ass, nor any Thing that is his, makes the Tenth. *See Spelman, T.* 1. *ut supr.*

The Council aforementioned, which was held at *Constantinople* in the Year 754, is by *Labbé* call'd, *Conciliabulum Constantinopolitanum Pseudoseptimum, &c. the little sham General Council of* Constantinople, *consisting of* 300 *Bishops, and call'd by* Copronymus *against the Use of Holy Images.* What Nonsense in Terms is this Title? first to call it *Little*, when it consisted of 300 Bishops, and which he calls *General*: Next, it was call'd by the Emperor *Constantine Copronymus*, who had Power to call a Synod. Besides, this Council had all the Marks of a General Council else, for there were Two Eminent Metropolitans that presided in it, *Theodosius* Bishop of *Ephesus*, and *Viceroy* of the *East*, and *Sisinnius* Metropolitan of *Pergas*; the See of *Constantinople* being at that Time vacant; and other Patriarchs groaning under the heavy Yoke of the *Saracens*. The Bishop of *Rome* had no Legate in this Council; and truly now it was as little necessary as reasonable; for the Western People had revolted from the Eastern Emperor, especially the City of *Rome* and all *Italy*, at the Instigation of this Pope.

The Title of the Council of *Frankford*, by *Labbé* and *Cossart*, is one of the most ridiculous Impostures they could have fram'd, for they say, *That the Acts of the Second* Nicene *Council, in the Case of Images, were here confirm'd.* Labb. T. 7. p. 1013. How unlikely this is, let the Reader judge by the Design of *Charlemain*'s calling this Council; for he, being rouz'd by *Alcuin*'s Letter in the Name of the Bishops and Kings of *Britain*, which was a Confutation of the Acts of the *Second* Nicene *Council*, forthwith calls this Synod of *Frankford*, in order to condemn the Acts of the *Second Synod* of *Nice*: Which they did; and yet the Editors have the Assurance

ſurance to ſay in the Title, That *Image-Worſhip* was here confirmed, at the ſame Time that it was actually condemn'd.

But I would fain know with what Face they could do thus, ſince it is impoſſible to have a clearer Account of the Acts of the *Frankford-Council*, than from thoſe Four Books call'd *Libri Carolini*: And this we ſhall find worth our Enquiring into. As to theſe Four Books, though they are call'd *Charlemain's*, it's thought they were not the Product of his own Brain, but were written by ſome learned Man or Men, who were to bear a Part in this Synod; and that they were confirm'd and approv'd by him. (*Spelman* and others are of Opinion, that *Alcuin* was the Author, and very probable, for none underſtood the Argument better, or was more able to defend the Cauſe againſt Images than he.) But whoever was the Author of the Books, they were approved by *Charlemain*, and by him ſent to *Hadrian* then Pope.

Upon this all the Advocates of the Pontificate are in Arms, every one drawing his Pen to give the Authority of theſe Books a Stab. *Paſſevin* boldly affirms they could not be *Charlemain's*, becauſe *Hadrian* wrote againſt them to *Charlemain*; from whence (ſays he) it's plain they were written by ſome Heretick, and by *Charlemain* were ſent to the Pope to anſwer them. *Cabbaſutius*, in his *Eccleſ. Notitia*, *p.* 320. plays the Juggler indeed, for he draws Arguments both from the *Oppoſers* and *Worſhipers* of *Images*, to invalidate their Authority; with many more to the ſame Purpoſe.

And now it is Time to enquire into the ſubject Matter of theſe Books, of which none gives a handſomer Account than the ingenious and learned Dr. *Cave*, *Hiſt. Lit. Par.* 1. *pag.* 264. *Par.* 2. *pag.* 490, 491, 492.

1. The

1. The First Book contains a Preface, and some Exceptions to the Emperor *Constantine*'s and his Mother the Empress *Irene*'s Letters; and the Texts of Scripture which the *Nicene Image-Worshipers* perversely abuse, in Defence of their Doctrine, are strictly examined, and their vain and absurd Interpretations of them expos'd.

2. In the Second Book, more Texts of Scripture, and Passages of the Fathers, quoted by the *Nicene* Champions, are examin'd; and by distinguishing between *Civil* and *Religious* Worship, it is plainly demonstrated how false their Reasonings are.

3. In the Third Book, after a Confession of Faith, the dangerous Opinions and absurd Arguments of several Bishops in the *Nicene* Council, not only in Matters of Faith, (especially about the Procession of the Holy Ghost) but of Images, and the Manner of worshiping them, and concerning the Miracles pretended to be produced in Confirmation of them, are discuss'd.

4. The Fourth Book consists of the same Argument; more Parts of the Acts of the *Nicene Council* being question'd; and concludes with this, *viz.* That the *Nicene Council* is improperly call'd *General*, because the Doctrine and Tradition of the Catholick Church was not constituted and observed in it. This is the Sum of *Charlemain*'s Books.

There is one Thing further remarkable about these Books. They are not to be found in any Editions of the Tomes of the Councils, nor among *Baluzius*'s *Capitulars*, I suppose, lest their People should be convinced by them. But the more Sanguine *Pontificate*-Champions boldly deny them to be genuine: Nay, they are so mad, as to affirm that they were written either by *Carolstadt*, or by some other *Lutheran* or *Calvinist*. Whereas

it is plain, that *John Filius*, a rigid Advocate of the Papacy, first published them from a very ancient Copy, which agrees exactly with that old Copy in the *Vatican* Library. And yet, right or wrong, these Books, though own'd by the most learned and best Men of their own Party, must be spurious, because they flie in the Face of their idolatrous and heretical Positions. But the Force of Truth is too great and powerful to submit to their weak and ridiculous Assertions, which in no Age could stand the Test.

As to the Acts of this Council, there were Two Things chiefly transacted in it:

1. The Heresy of *Elepandus* and *Felix*, who affirm'd the Son of God to be *adoptive*, was condemn'd. See the Epistles of Pope *Hadrian*, of the Bishops of *Italy*, *Gaul*, and *Germany*, to the Bishops of *Spain*; and of *Charlemain* to *Elipandus*, *Labb.* and *Cossart*, *T.* 7. *p.* 1014. These likewise, and other Monuments relating to *Felix*'s Case, Cardinal *d'Aguerre* hath in *Consil. Hisp. T.* 3. *p.* 91.

2. The Case of *Image-Worship* was here controverted; and 'twas concluded, That Images might remain in the Church for Ornament, and Remembrance-Sake; but that all Worship and Adoration should absolutely be abolish'd. The Acts of the *Second Council of Nice*, for Worshiping of Images, were condemn'd. All the Texts of Scripture, and Testimonies out of the Fathers, perversely used in their Defence, are carefully and strictly examin'd, and all their Sophistry and Tricks detected, and solidly refuted. Whence they decreed, That this Synod ought not to be call'd a *General* One, nor to be reckon'd so much as the Seventh; nor is it call'd by the Writers of that Time by any other Name than that of a *Sham-Synod*. *Vid. Cav. Par.* 2. *p.* 264.

[795.] The Papacy of *Leo* III. is very divertiing, and ſurprizing too; and they that love Romance may in the Life of this Pope have their Fill. *Binius*, like a tender-conſcienc'd Writer, cannot forbear telling an idle Story, though he rejects it as a Forgery when he has done. The Story is this: *In the Beginning of his Pontificate*, Leo *paſſing along, a Woman kiſs'd his Hand, which Kiſs ſet the Fleſh on Fire, ſo that he was forc'd to have it cut off; and from that Time, inſtead of kiſſing the Pope's Hand, they were oblig'd to kiſs his Foot.* As if the Foot of a Pope was Fire-Proof more than the Hand. Now in my Opinion, *Binius* might have ſav'd himſelf the Trouble of rejecting this Story, by not telling it. But ſince he is for rejecting Fables, I wonder he would not go on, and paſs by that idle and incredible Story of Pope *Leo* III. having his Eyes and his Tongue cut out of his Head, and afterwards having them miraculouſly reſtor'd to him. This is in my Opinion as ridiculous as any Thing can be told: And *Anaſtaſius* tells us, *Binius* might with as much Security have rejected it, as he did the former. But to ſpeak the plain Truth, if it was not for the Number of Fictions and Forgeries, the Lives of all the Popes hitherto would make but a ſmall Volume. *Labb. &c. T.* 7. *p.* 1075. *to p.* 1109. is taken up with the Life of this Pope, and *Binius*'s Notes on it; where, beſides the *Romances* already mention'd, you have ſeveral of the Editors moſt affected fundamental Topicks; particularly that darling one of the Biſhops of *Rome*'s Diſpoſing of Kingdoms and Crowns, *&c.* *Binius*, in his Note upon the Paſſage of *Leo*'s crowning *Charlemain* Emperor at *Rome*, is not a little peeviſh, ſaying, *None but an obſtinate Heretick will deny ſo celebrated a Story.* And *Labbé* and *Coſſart* in the Margin, *p.* 1108. wheedlingly inſinuate, *That Pope* Leo, *by*

 undoubted

undoubted Right, transferred the Imperial Crown from the Greeks *to* Charles *King of the* Franks, *and his Heirs.* But there is a great deal of Difference between asserting and proving: And, as peevish and positive as they are, I must take Leave to ask them, from whence they derive this Power of transferring Kingdoms from one Prince to another? And since I know they cannot answer for themselves, I shall only add, That 'tis very unlikely that those Popes should have a Right to dispose of or transfer Kingdoms from one to another, who were Supplicants for Help to those Princes to whom they pretend to transfer Crowns; and had no more Hand in disposing of the Crown they handled at the Inauguration of a King, than any Bishop may be said to have when he performs the Office at a King's Coronation. But in another Sense indeed, they may be said to have disposed (I do not say justly) of Kingdoms, *&c.* for from the Beginning of *Gregory* II.'s Pontificate, to the Time of *Charlemain*'s being crown'd Emperor at *Rome*, the Popes made it their Business to alienate the Western Empire from the Emperors of the East, who would not countenance and confirm their *Image-Worship*, till at last, as in this Pope's Time, the Western Empire in general revolted, and *Charlemain* was crown'd Emperor of the West by *Leo* III.

Of the Thirteen Epistles which are ascribed to this Pope, Nine of them, *viz.* from the Second to the 12th, are published by *Hermannus Conringius*, at *Helmstadt*, 1655. in which the blind Sides of this Pope are laid open; and therefore *Labbé* and *Cossart*, in *p.* 1113. in the Margin, say, *After the usual Manner of Hereticks, he cannot forbear calumniating the Holy Catholick Church, and her Supreme Bishop.*

The Thirteenth Epistle, to *Richulphus* Bishop of *Mentz*, is a pretty Discovery of the *Roman* Pontiff's trading

trading in *Relicks*: For he thanks *Richulphus*, who had sent his Present first, and then tells him he had sent him the *Relicks* which he had desired. This Epistle indeed, by the Menage of it, looks like authentick: And yet the Editors affirm this Epistle to be published, *A. D.* 1605. by *Serarius*, among St *Boniface*'s Epistles, *Numb.* 75. But this may be, and yet the Epistle be *Leo*'s; for it is very common with the Editors to publish one Epistle in several Places, and range it where Occasion most requires, then it serves a real Turn. *Labb. & Cossart, T.* 7. *p.* 1127.

The Editors tell us, *Labb. &c. T.* 7. *p.* 1158. there was a Synod call'd at *Rome*, but they do not say by whom, though the Emperor *Charlemain* was present at it: And it is very improbable *Leo* III. call'd it, because it was in his own Case. But it is worth while to observe their Cunning, for they have long since left off that imperious Way of saying, That a Council, be it where it would, was call'd by the Pope: But the Title of this runs plainly thus: *A* Roman *Synod in the Case of Pope* Leo *gather'd in the Presence of* Charlemain, *A. D.* 800. *and of Pope* Leo III. *An.* 5. *Upon this Council,* Binius's *Notes are very diverting. In the Year* 800. (says he) Charlemain *came to* Rome, *to put an End to those wicked Factions which had so long disturb'd the Church, and to restore her to her ancient Security. Upon which, a Synod is summon'd, and the Pope commands* (mark the Word) *the Bishops then present to be Judges in his Cause, and the Crimes objected against him; though he very well knew the Apostolick See to be subject to no Judge. And when no Body could prove the Crimes objected against him, by invoking the Divine Diety, he canonically purg'd himself.* And for all this, we have (says *Binius*) the single Authority of *Anastasius*. But let us examine these Things.

As to the Person that called this Council, (if there was one, for truly I can see no Occasion for any) it undoubtedly must be *Charlemain*, according to *Binius*, from *Anastasius*'s own Words: Charlemain *caused the Archbishops and Bishops, Abbots, noble* Franks *and* Romans, *to meet in the Church*, *Labb. ut supra.* Here the Editors have a little outshot themselves, for they make the Emperor call a Council under the Supreme Judge's Nose.

As to the Occasion of this Synod, I must confess, I am to seek; nor do the Editors give the least Light into it, either in their Notes, or in the Form of the Pope's *Purgation.* They only in general tell us, That he was accused of grievous Crimes, but mention neither the Crimes nor the Accusers.

The Method of the Pope's choosing his Judges is very preposterous and ridiculous, besides improble; for if he stood accused of any Crimes, the Power that conven'd the Synod ought to appoint the Judges. But then the pretty Manner of doing this! *He commanded the Bishops then present to judge him.* Abundance of Justice to be expected from Judges of the Criminal's own Choosing! But here arises another unlucky Contradiction, which, if *Binius* had not been very fond of his own Scribbling, he would have omitted. And that is this: The Editors in general are the most strenuous Asserters of the *Supremacy* and *Infallibility*, amongst whom none are more warm than *Binius*; yet here he destroys it, and pretends to revive it again: For if the Pope were liable to no Judicature, why should he submit to a Tryal before a Synod. But *Binius* very weakly endeavours to take this off, by saying, *Though he knew he was subject to no Judgment.* Indeed, I think they had better have left out this Sham Council, (for as such I cannot but take it) than for the Sake of Scribbling foist in a Council

to

to expose their Bishop, and destroy his Supremacy. Thus when Fancy outruns it self, it degenerates into downright Lying.

During the Pontificate of *Leo* III. *Paulinus* Bishop of *Aquileia* called a Council at *Altinum*; which being met, wrote a Synodal Epistle to the Emperor *Charlemain*, complaining of *John* Duke of *Venice*, and imploring his Help to punish him for the Murder of *John* Patriarch of *Grande*.

By the Title of this Council, *Lab. T.* 7. *p.* 1187. the Editors began to be either weary or asham'd of imposing on the World. For they only say of Pope *Leo*, that this Council was called in his Time, not under him, or by his Command, as usually; but nakedly own the Truth, and say it was called by the *Command of Paulinus*; the Pope being no otherwise mentioned, than as it was in his Time. By which we may see, rather than not be mentioned in a Council, they will have the Pope at the Head of a Council, tho' he has nothing to do there; or if it be only to take Place of the Emperor, before whom they place him.

In the Year 806, the first *Constantinopolitan* Council in this Century, is by the Editors entitled in the Time of Pope *Leo* III. But I cannot see any Reason they have (except it be that nothing Good or Bad must pass without the Knowledge or Consent of their Bishop) to take any Cognizance of the Pope having any Thing to do in a Council, which they call a *Council of Hereticks and Adulterers*; for such *Theodore Studita*, in his 25th and 30th Epistles to Pope *Leo*, calls it. *Labb. &c. T.* 7. *p.* 1191, 1192. and gives this Reason for it, *Because the Bishops that met there, connived at and approved the Adultery of the Emperor* Constantine *with* Theodoree, *and espous'd the Interest of* Joseph, whom he calls *Adulterii Copulatorem*. Upon this *Joseph*'s Account this Council

was called; who, having been some Time before deprived, was now restored. But here their Tenderness in saying it was only called in Pope *Leo's* Time, may do them some Service, because the Case was scandalous, and that he acted no Part in it. But then they might better have left his Name quite out of the Title, which would have cleared him altogether; which they do not care to do, because no Council, by their Consent, either Heretical or Orthodox, shall pass without the Pope in the Top of it.

The Second *Constantinopolitan* Council, which was held about the same Affair as the First, *A. D.* 809. carries *Leo's* Name in the Title as the former doth. And tho' the Editors own, That *Theodore*, in his Epistles to Pope *Leo* III. sets forth the Acts of these Councils as black and infamous as they deserved to be; yet I cannot find any Reply to countenance *Theodore*, or condemn those vile Decrees which these Councils made in Behalf of the adulterous Emperor, tho' nothing could be plainer than his Adultery; for he took *Theodore* to Wife, his lawful Wife being alive at the same Time, whom he had confin'd to a Monastery. Besides, that infamous Decree of this Second Council, (if he could have pretended to any Power over them) was highly worth his Cognizance; for they decreed in Favour of the Emperor *Constantine*, *That Divine Laws in Opposition to Kings were of no Force; and that they, who in this Case, in Imitation of St.* John Baptist *and St.* Chrysostome, *shed their Blood for Truth and Righteousness Sake, were not to be called Martyrs.* Here was a glorious Opportunity of *Leo's* exerting himself in the Defence of Truth against such Profaneness; whom if by his commonitory Letters (for his Power as yet extended no further) he could not restrain, he might easily have called in the Assistance of the

pious

pious Emperor *Charlemain*, to put a Stop to this dangerous Evil in a General Council. But instead of this, the Editors will have this Pope's Name at the Head of these Councils, tho' insignificantly; for they find him no Business or Power in them; and tho' importun'd by *Theodore*, he tamely passes by all Occurrencies in them.

In the Year 813, there were Five Councils called by the immediate Commmand of the Emperor *Charlemain*; which is expresly mentioned by the Editors in the Titles of each of them; *viz.* That of *Arles*, *Mentz*, *Rhemes*, *Turenne*, and *Chalon*. And which *J. Sirmondus* and *Binius* in their Notes confirm. *Labb. &c. T.* 7. *p.* 1239 and so on; tho' the Pope is no where mentioned either in the Acts or Canons of these Councils, except in the Titles of them; where the Year of his Pontificate is placed before the Year of the Emperor's Reign; which is with no other Design than to give the Pope the upper Hand of the Emperor; for it is plain the Pope was not consulted in the Matters of these Councils, most of the Canons of them being taken from the *Carthaginian* Councils of a far ancienter Date; with no other Design than to revive the Discipline of the Primitive Church, which the Patriarchs of *Rome* had too much neglected; and had lain longer dormient, but for the pious Care of the Emperor *Charlemain*, and those excellent *Gallican* Prelates who excited him to the promoting of so good a Work.

The Council of *Turenne*, which was one of the Five Councils called by the Emperor *Charlemain*, in the 17th Canon condemns the modern Practice of the Church of *Rome*, of *Praying in an unknown Tongue*. For this Canon, injoining the *Bishops to have Homilies furnish'd with necessary Admonitions for the Instruction of the People*, further adds, *That they*

should translate them into the common Roman *Tongue, that every one might the more easily understand them.*

The Editors pretend a Council at *Constantinople*, in the Year 814, in Favour of the old Topick *Image-Worship*. Wherein they suppose *Nicephorus* the Patriarch, and 170 Bishops, condemn'd *Antony* Metropolitan of *Sila*, (the great Enemy to Images, and the Emperor *Leo*'s chief Instrument in destroying them) excommunicated him and his Associates, and re-establish'd and confirm'd the Worship of Images. The Story of this Council is contained in a Synodical Epistle or Oration, by an anonymous Author; and is so stuff'd with ridiculous idle Fables, that no *Roman Legend* can exceed it. The Account of *Leo*'s consulting a Magician is an idle old Woman's Tale, and fit for nothing but to entertain Children with, who delight to hear of Inchanters and Hobgoblins, and such frightful Things. Certainly no Adversary of the modern Practices of the Church of *Rome* could ever do her so much Mischief, and bring such Discredit upon her as these idle Tales. But that which confirms me in the Opinion that this Council either was a Sham One, or abusively named instead of another, or put in by the Editors to serve a Turn, is the Collection of Canons which they father upon this Council. But before we enter upon Examination of these Canons, it will not be unpleasant to hear what *Labbe*'s Observation says of this Council and its Canons. *T. 7. p.* 1290. *Before we look toward* Greece, (says he) *and with* Baronius, Binius, *and others*, (excellent Company, and good at Discoveries!) *shew the State of that Heretical Synod of Image-haters, let us take Notice of that General Council held at* Constantinople *by* Nicephorus, *and other Holy Men, against* Antony *Metropolitan of* Sila; *the Account of which we shall take from the Synodical Epistle of some* Eastern *Prelates to the*

Empe-

Emperor Theophilus, *which was publish'd first by* Combefitius, *&c.* Indeed by this and such like Accounts as these, *Labbe* has very much lessen'd my Opinion of him; and the further I enquire into him, the more unsincere and trifling I find him. A greater Instance of which there cannot be than this very last Observation of his. For in his Recommendation of *Baronius* and *Binius* for Discoverers of Truth, he may not improperly be said to *pull himself by the Nose*; for it is somewhat absurd to commend them for faithful Guides, and Followers of Truth, who have so often gone astray, and whom he himself hath often convicted of notorious Errors and Untruths. Well, much Good do him with his hopeful Company.

In the next Place, I would fain know how any Writing can be called *Authentick*, which wants the Name of the Author; and, by Vertue of this Authority, he calls it a *General Council*; tho' in the Title (and of his own giving) he calls it, *The Council of* Constantinople. To which foresaid Account of this Council, he says, he has added the Canons which are inserted by *Leunclave*, *L.* 3. *T.* 1. *p.* 195. and therefore they must pass for genuine; especially because they are thrust into the Body of the *Canon-Law*. But this is not the first Cheat in this Kind which the Editors, *Gratian* and others, have palm'd upon the World; as has been already shewn, *p.* 51. *A. D.* 398. Besides, the 15th and 16th Canons make it plainly appear, That this Council must be altogether, or at least in Part a Forgery; for the one says, *A Simple Monk upon Occasion may baptize, and so may a Deacon.* By the Words *Simple Monk*, I take for granted he means a *Layman*; which the 16th Canon seems to corroborate, which says, *Infants not as yet baptiz'd, ought to be baptiz'd, if it should happen in a Place where no Priest is to be had.*

But if the Father, or any other Person, provided he be a Christian, should baptize, he doth not commit a Sin. This Canon, I think, fairly explains the former. The Menage of which calls the whole Council in Question; for the Doctrine of these Canons was not in Practice in this Age, no more than it was 500 Years before: And therefore I can look upon it no more than a Forgery, to maintain and support, by daubing upon it a little Colour of Antiquity, the modern Practice of the Church of *Rome* in worshiping Images, and allowing Laymen to baptize.

The same Year another Council was called at *Constantinople*, (which is term'd the Fourth of this Century) but upon a very different Occasion; and without a Sham Synodical Epistle to countenance it. It was called under the Emperor *Leo*, who had banish'd *Nicephorus*, and *Theodotus* was put in his Room; yet, tho' it was against *Image-Worship*, and called by the Emperor *Leo*, *Labbe* will put the Pope's Name into the Title. The Bishops who were at this Synod, condemned *Image-Worship* and the Second *Nicene* Council. This Synod abounds in Authorities as much as the former comes short; for most *Greek* Historians take Notice of this, particularly *Theodore* in his Epistle to this Synod, who being a Favourer of *Images*, excuses himself and others for not being present at it, defending the Cause of *Images* in the same Epistle.

Till the Year 816 its plain, that *Regulars* were subject to the Jurisdiction of the Bishop in whose District they liv'd, who were the proper Visitors of Abbots, and the Societies subjected to their Care. For in the First Year of *Lewis the Holy*, a Council was called at *Aix la Chapelle* in *Germany*, where a Hundred seventy and three Capitulars or Canons were constituted for the Discipline of Clergymen

and

and Monks; the Hundred thirty fourth of which leaves the final Judgment and Disposition of refractory and incorrigible Monks to the Discretion and Power of the Bishop. Indeed, the Bishop is not named, and therefore the Friends of the *Pontificate* may, perhaps, according to their common Way of *Subterfuging*, claim this Power to be invested in their Bishop of *Rome*; but Pope *Stephanus*, at that Time Bishop of *Rome*, had nothing to do in this Council, as I can find among the Editors; and therefore it must be meant only of the Bishop of the Diocess to whom the Monastery was subject.

About this Time *Chrodegange* Bishop of *Metz* publish'd Thirty four Capitulars or Canons, setting forth good and wholsom Discipline both for *Seculars* and *Regulars*, and which the Editors admit as authentick, several of which contradict the present Practice of the Church of *Rome*; particularly the Twentieth, which, speaking of the Discipline that ought to be observ'd in *Lent*, expressly forbids *Abstinence on Sundays. Labb. T.* 7. *p.* 1453. Which Canon passing without any Annotation, the Editor seems to forget himself, or, after so many Contradictions, to be asham'd of the Blunders he had made before. Otherwise, they might as well have thrown out this Canon, forbidding the *Sunday*'s *Fast*, as they have done that of the *Saturday*'s *Fast*, which the 65th *Apostolick Canon* forbids. This, they say, *No Father mentions. Labb. T.* 1. *p.* 60. *Bin. p.* 17, *ed.* 2. Though, as they often do, they contradict themselves; for they own, that *Ignatius*, *Clemens Romanus*, the Canons of the *Sixth General Council*, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Anastasius Nicenus*, and *Tertul. de jejun. adv. Psych. c.* 14 & 15. do all speak of *Saturday* as a Day on which Fasting was forbid. Besides, the Reason of forbearing Abstinence on *Sundays*, is plainly proved

proved from the Canons of the Apostolick Age, and many subsequent Centuries, by commanding all to *pray standing*, in regard to the Resurrection of our Blessed Saviour, which was on that Day. But these Things not answering the present *Innovations* of the modern Church of *Rome*, they must be laid aside, tho' justifiable by the most ancient Canons and Practice of the Apostolick and Primitive Fathers and Times.

Lewis the Holy, in the Third Year of his Reign, set forth Nine and twenty *Capitulars* relating to Discipline, the Sixteenth of which, by the Inhibition express'd in it, forbids the Bishops of *Italy* (*alias Lombardy*) for the Time to come, to exact Oaths or Gifts from those whom they ordain'd, contrary to Divine and Canonical Authority; the Punishment of which Offence was *Degradation*. Now these *Capitulars* coming out in the 3d Year of *Lewis the Holy*, it must be about the 19th of *Leo* III's Pontificate. How strange is it then, that such grievous Crimes, no less than *Simony*, should be acted even in the Pope's View, and he take no Notice of them? This plainly implies, that he must either be very loose in Point of Discipline, or that he had no Power. And truly I am apt to believe both: For if he had been regular, or able to suppress Irregularities, I do not see any Occasion for the Emperor's troubling himself in these Matters. But it is plain from the Canon it self, that *Leo* III. had no Power; for he is neither consulted nor named in this Affair. Besides, if we look back into Pope *Leo*'s Life, the Editors would make us believe he was one of the most active Bishops that sate at *Rome*.

[817.] Pope *Paschal* this Year ascends the Pontifical Chair, a strenuous Asserter of *Image-Worship*; which appears by his complimenting *Theodore*, and re-

refusing Entrance in *Rome* to the *Commissaries* of *Theodore* Patriarch of *Constantinople*. In the Second Year of his Pontificate, to shew his further Zeal, he erects a Monastery for the *Greek Refugee-Image-Worshipers*, in or near the Church of St. *Praxes* in *Rome*, and plentifully endowed it. His Life is made up by the Editors of a great many Benefactions to pious Uses. *Labb. T.* 7. *p.* 1491, *&c.* But notwithstanding all their Flourishes in Praise of him, *Guag. Æmil.* in the Life of the Emperor *Lewis*, makes him guilty of a very false Step in Relation to his *Supremacy* and *Infallibility*; for he very submissively begs Pardon of the Emperor for accepting the *Pontificate* without his Consent. There are several Fables in this Pope's Life fit only to amuse Children and Fools with, such as finding the Bodies of *Cecilia* and other Saints discover'd to him in a Vision, the miraculous extinguishing a great Fire, which burnt the *English College*, by his meer Presence. And tho' *Binius*, in his Notes upon this Pope's Life, most magnificently applauds his Conduct in other Things, particularly for his strenuous Defence of *Image-Worship*, yet he drops him very unhandsomly at last, by bringing his good Name in Question, *Labb. &c. T.* 7. *p.* 1501, 1502. *For* says he, *at the Coronation of* Lotharius *the Son of* Lewis, *there happen'd a great Tumult, in which two Chief Men of the Church of* Rome *were slain, and for which Pope* Paschal *was very much suspected by* Lotharius. *From which Calumny he was forced to purge himself by an Oath.* And then going on with the foresaid Story of his extinguishing the Fire by his Presence, he adds, *Which, Things, if they were true, it's likely he did to take off the Suspicion of Murder, tho' the Author of the Life of* Lewis *contradicts it in plain Words.* But let us examine these Passages a little. As to the Murder, of which Pope *Paschal* is suspected by the Emperor *Lotharius*, and his

his purging himself by an Oath, they plainly imply a *Legal Trial*, which are *Binius*'s Words, *Præstito Juramento legitimè se purgavit. Ibid.* Then this Trial must imply a superior Power in some Person or Persons else, who must judge him, or at least call him in Question, and oblige him to clear himself. From whence it is plain he had a Superior; and, tho' an *Infallible Judge*, was forced to clear himself according to Form.

The two Epistles which are father'd on this Pope, smell very strong of the Forge. The First is to *Petronacius* Archbishop of *Ravenna*, and is made up of nothing but broken and imperfect Sentences. Which, how corrupt soever it be, as *Labbé* in the Margin owns, *T.* 7. *p.* 1502. serves to shew, that the Church of *Ravenna* owns the Confirmation of all her Privileges to the Bishop of *Rome*; and therefore shall not be left out, come from whence it will.

The Second Epistle is intended only as a Confirmation of the finding the Body of St. *Cecilia* and other Relicks. This is so infamous and extravagant an Imposture, that none but the blindest Bigot can admit. The Author of this Pope's Life tells us, *Labb. T.* 7. 1494. That the Virgin *Cecilia* appeared to *Paschal* in a Vision, directing him to the Place where she was buried; where he found her Body wrap'd up in those rich Vestments in which she suffer'd Martyrdom, and to that very Time moist with her Blood. He likewise there found the Body of her betrothed Husband *Valerian* and others; with Abundance of such like Stuff. As barefac'd a Piece of Forgery as this is, *Binius* gives it his Sanction, quoting the *Vatican* for his Authority; from whence, he tells you, *Baronius* recites the Story. *An.* 821. *n.* 2 & 3. from whom he takes it. But lest that Authority should not be suf-

ſufficient, according to Cuſtom, an Epiſtle muſt give it better, which they expect all ſhall pay Obedience to. The whole Compoſition of this Epiſtle ſhews it one continued Impoſture; for, in the firſt Place, it is written to no Body, the Title running plainly thus: *Epiſtle* II. *of Pope* Paſchal I. *about the finding of the Relicks of St.* Cecilia. And beſides, the Body of the Epiſtle is no more than a bare Tranſcript from the Life of this Pope; and is foiſted in here for no other End, than to confirm the Uſe of theſe and other trifling Relicks.

In the Appendix, *Labb. T.* 7. *p.* 1869. there is an Epiſtle of Pope *Paſchal* to *Barnard* Archbiſhop of *Vienna*, which the Editors pretend they took from the *Florentine* Library. And it may be ſo. Nor do I believe they care from whence they take any Thing that will but ſerve a Turn. But this Epiſtle has two or three Marks which render it very ſuſpicious. Firſt, he ſeems to intimate to *Barnard*, *That he did but know that he had taken upon him the Government of the Church of* Vienna. By which it appears, his Supremacy had nothing to do in the Buſineſs of making *Barnard* Archbiſhop there. Then, the Uſe of the *Pall*, which he recommends to *Barnard*. From whence, if this Epiſtle were genuine, we may juſtly infer, that Archbiſhop *Barnard* had received no Pall from *Rome*, and that the Church of *Vienna* was ignorant of the Uſe of it. The Date of this Epiſtle comes barely within Time, and from the Epiſtle of Pope *Eugene* II. to this ſame Archbiſhop *Barnard*, which bears the ſame Date, it is moſt certain one, if not both, muſt be a Forgery; which we will further examine in the Epiſtles of that Pope.

[824.] The Editors, in the Life of *Eugene* II. give him a general Character. But *Binius*, who loves to be Doing, though it be but Miſchief, and that

that to his own Cause too, in his Notes on this Pope's Life, tells us, *Labb T. 7. p.* 1541. That *Eugene* II. was created Pope in such a Schism, that the Emperor *Lewis* was forced to send his Son *Lotharius* into the City, who there publish'd an Edict or Order, *Forbidding any to meddle in the Election of a Pope, but those* Romans *who of old Time had the Power of Choosing.* And tho' by the subsequent Part of this Edict, which commands *the Transgressors of it to appear before the Emperor to answer for their Neglect of it.* Yet, to give some Countenance to the Temporality of the Bishop of *Rome*, which by this seems quite eclips'd, *Binius* says, This Edict was made by the Consent of the Pope. Certainly if the Pope could have made an Edict of this Kind of any Force, the Emperor would not have been at the Trouble of sending his Son to quiet a Tumult, and regulate the disorderly Election of the Bishop of *Rome*, which the Pope himself might have done, had he been so powerful then as the Editors would fain represent him.

Part of the *Diploma* which the Editors father upon this Pope, is by *Labb. in Marg. T. 7. p.* 1542. said to be in *Hundius, in Metrop. in Utolpho Archiepiscopo Laureacensi*: So that, as in the Case of the two Epistles to *Barnard* Archbishop of *Vienna*, one or both must be a Forgery. But that which makes this look more suspicious is, there are Eleven Decrees which are tack'd to this *Diploma*, some of which are Decrees of Pope *Eugene* III. who was not made Pope till the Year 1145.

The Epistle of Pope *Eugene* II. to *Barnard* Archbishop of *Vienna*, appears a Sham from several Marks. The Style is ridiculous, beginning with *Congaudeo valde*, and such like; the Argument without Meaning, or at best obscure and unintelligible:

ble; only, I ſuppoſe, for which it was forged, in the Tail of it, there appears ſomething like a Prerogative peculiar to the Biſhop of *Rome*. But that which quite deſtroys the Reputation of this Epiſtle, and makes it appear a direct Forgery, is the falſe Date. For this Epiſtle is dated the 8th of *July*, in the 4th Year of the Emperor *Lewis*, which was the firſt Year of Pope *Paſchal*; for it is moſt certain from all Hands, particularly *Cabbaſutius*, who gleans from *Baronius* and others, in his Table of the Popes, that Pope *Eugene* II. did not take Poſſeſſion of the Pontifical Chair till the Year 824, whereas the 4th Year of the Emperor *Lewis the Holy* was the Year of our Lord 817. So that, according to this Chronology, *Eugene* muſt aſſume the Name of Pope, and write this Epiſtle, Seven Years before he was Pope. But theſe are ſmall and trivial Blunders with the *Infallible Judge*, according to the Editors. Truly, if I were of their Intereſt, I would adviſe them to defend their Topicks by injoining an implicite Faith on the People, and not pretend to prove and maintain them by ſuch very wretched Authorities, which muſt eternally faſten on them a moſt poor and deſpicable Opinion among the Learned and Ingenuous.

[827.] Pope *Valentine* ſat but 40 Days; and yet there is as large an Encomium beſtow'd upon him, as if he had held the Pontificate ſo many Years. To him ſucceeds *Gregory* IV. a Prelate of extraordinary Piety and Goodneſs, and whoſe Character would appear more illuſtrious without that fulſome nauſeous Flattery which *Anaſtaſius* beſtows on it. In which *Binius* (who rather than be idle will do Miſchief) muſt have a Hand too. There are two Epiſtles of this Pope's extant. *Labb. T.* 7. *p.* 1571. The firſt of which by the Editors is directed to *all Biſhops in General, in the Caſe of* Aldri-

 cus

ous *Bishop of* Cenoma, *that he should be accus'd no where but at* Rome, *setting forth the Power of the Papal See.* According to this Title, and the Tenure of the Epistle, any one might imagine, that this Pope claim'd an *Universal Power*, and that all Appeals ought to be made only to *Rome*. But the true Title runs thus: *To all our most Beloved Brethren and Fellow-Bishops in* France, Germany, *and* Europe; by which he does not seem to claim any Obedience but from these Bishops in those Countries which were within his Patriarchate; no Mention being made of the Eastern Churches, which at that Time were subject to their own Patriarch.

And here it is worthy Observation, That during the Reign of the Emperor *Lewis the Holy*, there were many Councils call'd by his immediate Command, the Pope being not so much as mention'd in any of them, except by the Editors in the Title of some of them, though no otherwise, than that his Name is inserted in the Title, and, to gloss the Matter, is put before the Emperor's; though, as is said before, he is neither mention'd nor consulted with in the Canons of them which relate to Ecclesiastick Discipline, and the mutual Duty of Kings and Subjects. One of these was

The Council of *Paris*, (which is the Second of this Century, and by the Editors reckon'd the Sixth) call'd immediately by the Emperor *Lewis the Holy*, and the Metropolitans of *Germany*, *Belgium*, *&c.* were appointed by the Emperor himself, as *Sirmondus* in his Notes owns, *Labb. T. 7. p.*1667. and the general Epistle of the Emperor confirms, *ibid, p.* 1590. by which this Council was summon'd. Many excellent Chapters or Canons were constituted by the Bishops in this Synod, which are very plain and positive, confirm'd by many Texts of Scripture, and Quotations of the Fathers, and several

veral of the Orthodox Bishops of *Rome*; and therefore the Editors pass them without any Note or Animadversion, which may not a little be wonder'd at, considering that the Tenth Canon strikes at the very Root of their Doctrine of *Purgatory*, which expressly forbids any to believe such Doctrine. The Words are these: *It has been said by some Christians, that they who are born again in Christ, though they live and die in Sin, shall not be punish'd with eternal Fire, but for a Time in* Purgatory. *And whereas many affirm, but cannot prove this from Holy Scripture, let them take Heed that they not only not believe this, but not so much as mention it with their Lips, lest thereby they delude themselves and others with a vain Security.* Labb. T. 7. p. 1649. Whether the Text is too positive, or whether *Binius* grew more modest, I will not say; but, as has been before observ'd, *Binius* and others did not use to stick at a Comment upon such an Occasion, and produce even a Contradiction for an Argument in Defence of any darling modern Topick. But though they had said ever so much in this Case, the Words of the Canon are so plain, that they can admit of no Subterfuge; and it is most evident, that the Emperor and the Fathers of this Council were of a quite different Opinion to the modern Romanists in this Point of Purgatory. *

To this Time, which was in the Year 829, all Abbots, Abbesses, and Regulars, were subject to the Visitation and Jurisdiction of the Bishop of the Diocese in which they liv'd, as appears by the 18th Canon of this Council; though now, like lawless Exempts, they rather Lord it over, than obey their Diocesan. *Lab. T. 7. p. 1664.*

---

* Note, *Compare this Canon with the Predestinarians of these Times.*

[844.] To this Time likewise the Papacy was a very precarious and uncertain Thing; for tho' *Sergius* II. was a noble *Roman*, and Arch-Presbyter of the Church of *Rome*, yet upon his Entrance on the Pontificate, *Lewis* was sent by his Father *Lotharius* the Emperor, in all Haste, to charge the *Romans* not to proceed to the Election of a Pope till the Emperor had approv'd of the Person they intended to elect. Soon after came the Emperor himself; at which Time Pope *Sergius* sooths all by anointing *Lewis*, *Lotharius*'s Son, King of the *Lombards*. *Labb. T.* 7. *p.* 1797. From whence any Man may safely conclude, that the Bishops of *Rome* had not as yet taken upon them that exorbitant Power in Temporals, nor assumed that Superiority in the Catholick Church which they now claim.

[847.] Pope *Leo* IV.'s Life is usher'd in by *Anastasius* with a long and numerous Train of Encomiums, which I shall not go about to contradict; for where there is any Colour of Truth, I think we ought to believe the best of all Men; and rather transmit the Virtues than the Vices of the Deceas'd to Posterity. This Pope, it seems, with much Reluctancy is promoted to the Pontifical See; but, says *Anastasius*, *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 3. notwithstanding the unanimous Consent of the People of *Rome* in his Election, without the Imperial Licence they dare not consecrate him. This still takes off from the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*; who, it seems by this Instance, had not as yet acquir'd that Latitude of Power which his Successors have since assum'd. The Two Miracles said to be perform'd by him, and introduced with their usual ridiculous Formality, are enough to persuade Men, that the whole Account of this Pope is fabulous, and do very much lessen his real good Acts. The Prayers of good Men are undoubtedly very prevalent

lent with God; but that the Presence of this Pope, though attended with the whole Catalogue of Crosses and Relicks, should put to Flight a Basilisk, that had destroyed great Numbers of People; or that by his single Appearance the Fire should spare St. *Peter*'s Church more than it had done other Churches or Palaces, is what I cannot so readily credit. These Fables diminish the Characters of the best of their Popes, in the Opinion of all prudent Men, who would appear more holy to the World without them. *Binius* must give his Hand to these Miracles, which he confirms without Scruple, swallowing others of the same Authority. But when he comes to animadvert upon the aforesaid Passage of the Emperor's confirming the Election of the Bishops of *Rome*, he cannot forbear shewing himself a very partial and unfair Commentator. *Ibid. p.* 29. *Pope* Leo (says he) *null'd the Right of Confirming the Elected Popes, which had either, through Fear, been given by the People of* Rome *to the Emperors, or by them foully usurp'd.* In lieu of which, Pope *Leo* obliges himself to pay Obedience to the Imperial Laws. Hitherto then it is plain the Bishops of *Rome* had assumed no Sovereignty in Temporals: Nor by the Words quoted by *Binius* does it appear that he had null'd *the Right of Confirming the Election of the Bishops of* Rome; for they say no otherwise than thus: *It is agreed between us and you, That the Election and Consecration of the Bishop for the Time to come, be lawfully and canonically perform'd.* From which Words, *Binius* will not find it an easy Thing to infer, That because the Election and Consecration of the Bishop ought to be done canonically, that therefore the Emperors had quitted their Right of confirming the Elections. And whatever *Binius*, or any of the Editors, may say in this Point, it is plain from the Fragment of

an Epistle from this Pope to the Emperor *Lotharius*, That *Leo* IV. assumed no such Power as *Binius* would palm upon him: For in that Epistle *Leo* excuses himself for not conferring the Pall, *&c.* on *Alteus* Bishop of *Autun* in *Burgundy*; beginning thus: *Mandastis, &c. You commanded, That the Privilege and Pall should be conferr'd on* Alteus, *but we beg your Majesty not to be affronted,* &c. *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 32, 33.

[855.] That the Emperors still kept up the Right of confirming Elections of the Popes, is plain likewise from the Life of Pope *Benedict* III. In Opposition to whom, the Emperor *Lewis* set up *Anastasius* the Priest-Cardinal, who in the last Pope's Time was depos'd for Non-Residence in his Parish. This Fewd ran so high, that poor *Benedict* was stripp'd of his Pontifical Habits, scourg'd, and thrown into Prison: Nor could he find any Redress till the Emperor's Ambassadors consented to this Election. *Lab. T.* 8. *p.* 227. There is one Thing in this Pope's Life, in the Page now mention'd, which puts me in mind of something like it in the last Pope's Life by the same Hand, *viz. Anastasius*; and that is this: After *Leo*, with much Importunity, was chosen Bishop of *Rome*, we are told, that they, observing the ancient Custom, kissed his Feet. How ancient this Custom was I do not remember, or that to this Time it is any where recogniz'd by any of the Editors: However here it is recorded to have taken Place; which I cannot think is for any other End mention'd under the Name of an old Custom, but to countenance the subsequent Practice of it in the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of *Rome*. *Lab. T.* 8. *p.* 2. For in the Life of Pope *Benedict* III. the same Custom is observ'd; where they tell us, That those who had been his greatest Enemies before came

and

and kiss'd his Feet, and acknowledged their former Offence. *Lab. T.* 8. *p.* 227. But a little further they tell us, that the Emperor's Ambassadors, who had most strenuously before oppos'd his Election, were reconcil'd, and talk'd more kindly with him than before; but not one Word of their kissing his Feet.

I shall here take Notice of one Instance, (tho' I could of many) and so take my Leave of that ridiculous Custom of the Editors, in thrusting the Pope's Name into the Titles of the Councils, tho' they knew nothing of the Matter; which cannot more plainly appear than in the Second Council of *Soissons* in *France*, *A. D.* 853. The Title of this Council does but lamely own the Pope, telling us, it was held 10 Kal. of *May*, *A. D.* 853. which was in the Sixth Year of *Leo* IV. and the Thirteenth of *Charles the Bald*. Now for any Service this does them, they might as well have left the Pope's Name out, for he is neither named in the Canons, nor in the Acts of this Council; nor among the Thirty Bishops and more, besides Abbots, *&c.* is there one to be found who subscrib'd to this Council in the Pope's Name, which never was omitted in any Council where the Bishop of *Rome* had his Legates. Moreover, the First Canon of this Council makes it plainly appear, that the Pope had nothing to do in this Council; for it positively says, That *Hincmar* Bishop of *Rhemes*, *Vanilo* Bishop of *Sens*, and *Almaric* Bishop of *Turenne*, all of them Metropolitans, presided in this Council in their own proper Persons, and as Metropolitans of the Places they represented, not as Substitutes, by a delegated Authority from another; which, if it had been so, would have been accordingly express'd. But *Labbé*, *T.* 8. *p.* 80. in the Preface to the Canons of this Council, very fairly and honestly

nestly tells the Truth, owning the Authority that call'd it. *The most Glorious* Charles, *Son of the most Religious Prince* Lewis, *consented to the Bishops, then desirous to hold a Council, and commanded them to meet at* Soissons, *in the Monastery of St.* Medard *and St.* Sebastian, *on the* 10 *Kal. of* May: *Where the King himself, laying aside all Secular Affairs, vouchsaf'd to be present, that he might not only by his Love to Religion shew himself to be a Son of the Church, but upon Occasion protect them with his Power.* Here it is plain by whose Authority this Council was call'd: Nor is the Pope so much as mention'd in this Preface, though they thrust him into the Title. The Occasion of this Council was very remarkable; and if Pope *Leo* had been minded to concern himself in it, he could not have wish'd for a more glorious Opportunity of shewing himself in the Interest of the Church and State: For *Ebbo* was deposed for Treason against the Emperor *Lewis* in the Second Council of *Thionville*; but *Lewis* dying, and *Lotharius* succeeding, he obtain'd an Edict, whereby he was restor'd; upon which he ordain'd several Clergymen: Which *Hincmar*, when he came to the See of *Rhemes*, would not allow; for *Ebbo* was lawfully and canonically depos'd, and not canonically restor'd; wherefore his Acts could be reckon'd no more than the Acts of an Usurper, and were invalid. Now it is most certain, if the Pope had been any Way concern'd or consulted in this Business, by himself or his Legates, it is highly improbable, that the Editors would have left him out, who take all Occasions to mention his Name. Nor would *Sirmondus* in his additional Notes on this Council have neglected it. *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 1943. *in App.*

To this Time likewise (as has before been observ'd) the Bishop of *Rome* either totally neglected, or

or at least did not claim any Power over the Monasteries and Religious Houses of *Gaul:* But it rather seems, the Court of *Rome* had not as yet pretended to any such Supremacy; for it is plain from the Twelve Capitulars of *Charles the Bald*, King of *France*, which are annexed to the Second Council of *Soissons*, that all Religious Houses were under the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of the Diocese; and though they were liable to a Royal Visitation, in case of Dilapidation, Irregularity, Alienation, or otherwise, yet the King's Commissioners, sent on Purpose to enquire into Abuses, and strengthen'd with the Royal Authority, could not act without the *Council and Consent of the Bishop* of that District they for the Time visited; which is express'd in those very Capitulars, *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 93, 94. So that to the Year 853, the Regulars of the Latin Church were not poison'd with those rebellious Principles they now profess, but liv'd in due Obedience to their Bishop, who had Power to restrain them according to their Demerit, without any Delegation of Power from the See of *Rome*. And though King *Charles* did interpose here, yet it was, as is said before in the Preface to the Second Council of *Soissons*, to protect the Church with his Power; for in case of some Abuses, where a Bishop may lawfully, but cannot correct, the Assistance of the Prince is not only seasonable, but highly necessary. And, to the immortal Glory of this pious Prince, it must be said of him, that he was a *Nursing Father* to the Church, all his Edicts tending to her Service and Honour; not only enquiring into the Abuses committed in his own Reign, but into the Alienations of the Church's Patrimony in his Predecessors Time; as is expresly mention'd in the Second Capitular, *ibid.* where, in Conjunction with the Bishop of the Diocese, and other his faithful

Subjects,

Subjects, he desires that they may consider what and how they ought to act in Obedience to *God's Will and their own Salvation*: A Consideration worthy so pious a King, and to be imitated by all succeeding Christian Princes. But in the Case of Canonical Obedience, which the inferior Clergy ow'd to their proper Bishop, especially Presbyters, the Fourth Capitular is very positive, referring wholly to the Disposition and Discretion of the Bishop of the Diocese wherein they live, not the least Mention being made either of the Regale or Pontificate. And as if this pious Prince, and those holy Fathers in this Council, foresaw the unbridled Wildness and Disobedience of the modern Regulars to their Diocesans, there is a most express and peculiar Provision made in the Sixth Capitular to restrain them from injuring the Church in her Tythes, obliging the Missionaries, in Conjunction still with the Bishop of the Place, and Chiefs of the Monasteries, to inspect into the Estates of Monasteries, that they pay Tythes; and that if any Dispute should arise, they should all appear before the King, in whose Presence the whole Affair was to be determin'd.

What I have a little before said of the Seasonableness, and sometimes Necessity of the Church's calling in the Royal Aid to assist her, is in the Tenth Capitular more particularly express'd, and which is another remarkable Instance of the tender Love and Duty of this Prince to the Church: For there it is said, *That the Magistrates shall assist the Bishops in their Visitation; and whom the Bishop by Excommunication cannot compel, they by the Royal Authority and Power shall force to Penitence and Satisfaction.* Lab. T 8. p. 94. And the Eleventh Capitular goes further with the same; declaring, That tho' the Bishops or Chiefs of Monasteries should be unreason-

reasonable in their Demands, yet he will lay no Royal Command upon Ecclesiastick Benefices; which plainly shews he was a *Nursing Father* to indulge and cherish, and not imperiously domineer in or over the Church.

But to keep the Regulars still in Subjection to their Superiors, the same Year, *viz.* 853, in the Pontificate of *Leo* IV. that excellent Prelate, with the rest of the holy Fathers assembled in the Second *Roman* Council of this Century, strictly forbad Abbots, or any others, except those who can confer the Order of Priesthood, and take canonical Cognizance of offending Presbyters, to collate to Churches. *Lab. T.* 8. *p.* 119. And, to preserve the Rights and Patrimony of the Church from any Incroachment, by Way of Supplement to this Council, the same Pope *Leo* subjoins, That all Bishops throughout their Districts, by themselves and Presbyters, charge their People duly to pay their First-Fruits and Tythes, under Pain of Excommunication: At which Time all Monasteries were liable to the Inquisition and Visitation of the Bishop of the Diocese.

It is most certain nothing is so illustrious as Truth, or can render the Character of a good Man more bright: And therefore all ingenuous Men will allow I have done more Honour to the Memory of this holy Father, Pope *Leo* IV. by telling no more than the Truth of him, than all the Editors have by their fulsome and fabulous Encomiums.

[858.] It is worth observing, That all or most of the Popes were chosen with much Reluctancy, according to *Anastasius*: And though many of them have been known to wade through Blood and Bribery to this desirable Post in the Church, yet they seemingly submitted to a Sort of Holy Rape from

from the People upon their Elections. Of th Number is *Nicholas* I. whose Advancement to th Ponficate I shall not charge with either of th aforesaid Crimes; only by the way observe, Th he was consecrated in the Presence of *Ca Lab. T.* 8. *p.* 251. for what Reason I cannot im gine, except that before hinted, of the Emperor confirming the Election; which hitherto, notwith standing what they talk of *Leo* IV. the Emperor had not parted with.

The Life of this Pope entertains us with Variet of Stories: Among which, none are so remarkab as that about *Lotharius*'s divorcing his Wife *Theu berg*, and excommunicating *Theutgand* and *Gunth* Archbishops of *Treves* and *Colen*, who in the Th Synod of *Metz* were forward Instruments in th Confirmation of the Divorce of *Theutberg* from *L tharius*, and of his marrying *Waldfrad*. In whic Transaction it is to be observed, That the Pope Legates in this Council were the great Promoter and Instigators of what was there done; for which *Radoaldus* was afterwards deprived and excommu- nicated.

The Fifth Council of *Rome* in this Century which was held *A. D.* 863. by *Nicholas* I. first null the Acts of the Third Council of *Metz*, and the deposes *Gunthar* and *Theutgand*, the Two Ring- leaders and Asserters of *Lotharius*'s Divorce. The Decrees of this Council being publish'd, the Le- gates of the Council of *Metz* make as sharp a Re- ply, for despising the Sentence of the Pope, they charge him with Ambition, who being an Apostle among Apostles, assum'd to himself the Empire of the World: With Partiality and Injustice, for not correcting what he found amiss in the Acts which they sent to him, and returning them again, where- by they might have been better inform'd, and con- curr'd

d with the Opinion of their Fellow Bishops: Treachery, for that they being called in to resence, and suspecting no Ill, ordering the n to be lock'd on them, by a Conspiracy of Clergy, Part Laymen, in a most Uncanonical irregular Manner, without Accuser, Witness berty of Defence, he most arbitrarily and ti-lically had condemned them, all other Metro-ans and Diocesans at that Time being absent; Abundance more to the same Purpose *Lab.* p. 770, 771, 772, *&c.* This is a heavy Charge, if true, makes Pope *Nicolas* look very black; he Editors make light of it, for they never le themselves with any other Answer than this, that only in the Margin of *Lab. ibid.*) *viz.* *are Reproaches common to all Hereticks against the*

hould have observ'd to the Reader, That in Front of this Fifth *Roman* Council, there is a ce by Way of Epistle by Pope *Nicolas*, which in Running Title is thus; *Pope* Nicolas *to all Bi-* which, in the Head of a Council, may seem rry an Air of Supremacy with it; tho' the quent Title is quite different, for that says thus: las, *Bishop and Servant of the Servants of God, to ost Reverend and Holy our Brethren the Archbishops Bishops of* France, Italy, *and* Germany.

t to return to the Charge of *Gunter* and *Theut-* which the Editors no other Way excuse than aid in the Margin, very much of it is confirm'd by subsequent Actions of this Pope's Life. The

tius, and the Council called by him, and openly sided with *Ignatius* the deposed Patriarch; to which Sentence tho' his Legates had given their Consent, yet he denied his, darting most bitter Reproaches and Calumnies against *Photius*, and afterwards upon their Return excommunicated both his Legates. But that which inflam'd this Pique of the Pope against *Photius*, was his Attempt to regain King *Michael* and the *Bulgarians*, who were lately come over to the Christian Faith, and were really Subjects to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*. And therefore the Pope could have no Reason to take it ill from *Photius*, for the Irregularity lay on the Pope's Side in invading the Property of another's Patriarchate, which is expresly forbid by many Canons of both *Eastern* and *Western* Churches; and tho' he had sent two Legates to confirm the *Bulgarians* in the Faith of Christ, (which was but a charitable Office, and might be expected from a Bishop of the Christian Church) yet he had no Right or Claim to their Canonical Obedience, which was due only to their proper Bishop. But if we search a little deeper into the Cause of this implacable Resentment of Pope *Nicolas* against *Photius*, we shall find, that Image-Worship was the Cement, which had so strictly engaged *Nicolas* and *Ignatius*. Of this we have a fair Proof from the 7th Epistle of this Pope to the Emperor *Michael*. *Lab. T. 8. p.* 288, 289. wherein, after he had acquainted him with the Sentence he had pass'd on *Photius*, and obliged him to restore *Ignatius* to the See of *Constantinople*, and recal those Bishops whom *Photius* had banish'd, he addresses the Emperor thus in Behalf of Image-Worship: *Being obliged strictly to observe the Decrees of our Holy Ancestors, and the Opinions of the Fathers, we command that the Images of our Lord and his Virgin Mother, and of all the Saints, from just*

Abel,

Abel, (*according to the ancient Custom of the Church*) *be preserv'd inviolable and untouch'd; and that* John *Patriarch of* Constantinople, *who destroyed Images, with his Followers, be excommunicated.* These and other Injunctions the Emperor *Michael* did not live to perform; for he was murder'd by *Basilius Macedo*, who thereupon ascends the Imperial Throne; for which Murder *Photius*, like a true primitive Father, bravely excommunicates him; and *Basilius* in Revenge deposes *Photius* and recalls *Ignatius*, with whom return'd Image-Worship, and to which *Photius* was a great Enemy. About Nine Years after, *Basilius* bates of his Resentment, and is reconcil'd to *Photius*, whom in a short Time after, *Ignatius* dying, he restores to the See of *Constantinople*, *John* VIII. being then Pope, between whom and *Photius* there was an Orthodox Understanding: Of which more when we come to that Pontificate. I shall not insist upon several of this Pope's extravagant Actions; such as his burning *Photius*'s Book, his wheedling the Emperor *Michael* (a known Matricide) to depose *Photius*, which he could not obtain; his triumphing over deposed *Photius*, tho' he had incurr'd the Emperor *Basilius*'s Resentment, and this Sentence, for no other Reason than excommunicating him for the Murder of *Michael* his Predecessor, *&c.* So great was their Malice against the Enemies of the Pontificate, or those that would not go their Lengths in all Things, that they would patronize a Parricide, a Rebel, an Usurper, or any Thing, rather than stand by or defend a pious Cause that interfer'd with their Supremacy. I will not pretend to give a Character of this holy and learned Patriarch *Photius*, which has already been done by several learned Pens; Let the Character of an Enemy suffice, and that is *Michael* the Monk, who acknowledges him *to be eminent for*

good

good Life and Literature. Baron. T. 10. *An.* 858. I am confident, that since St. *Peter's* Time the Editors will be very much puzzled to find so excellent a Patriarch in the *Roman Kalendar.* But we shall say more of this Patriarch in the Pontificate of Pope *John* VIII.

The Editors, in the Story of *Hincmar* Archbishop of *Rhemes,* shew themselves very partial and unfair, accusing and condemning this good Man of Pride, Arrogance, Cruelty, and what not. But none so unhandsomly attack him as *Cabbasutius, Notit. Eccles. p.* 351, 352, *&c.* where he tells us, That since the Time of the Apostles there never was such an Instance of Hatred in one Catholick Bishop towards another, as this of *Hincmar* Archbishop of *Rhemes,* against his Nephew *Hincmar* Bishop of *Laon.* But the Story of *Rothard* being first, we'll begin with that. *Hincmar* of *Rhemes,* says *Cabbasutius, ibid.* was a Man plentifully adorn'd with natural and acquir'd Wit, and in great Favour with *Charles* the *Bald,* which so puff'd him up, that, whenever he had Opportunity, he carried all before him. Agitated by this Kind of Spirit, he falls upon *Rothard* Bishop of *Soissons,* who had deposed a Priest for his dissolute Life. Now it is very strange and unlikely, that a Man of *Hincmar's* Piety, Prudence, and Learning, should prosecute a Bishop for deposing an irregular Priest, and such an one, as *Cabbasutius, p.* 301. says, was taken in the Fact of Adultery. Nor can it be supposed, that a Synod of Christian Bishops would join with their Metropolitan in so unjust and wicked a Sentence. But the aforesaid Author says further, that King *Charles* commanded this Council to be called, *viz.* the Council of *Senlis, A. D.* 683. in which *Rothard* was condemn'd, and therefore calls it a Sham-Synod, *p.* 351. which he would scarce have done, or charg'd that Prince

h countenancing ſuch irregular Proceedings, had ›een living. But be the Cauſe of this Sentence as :k as *Cabbaſutius* makes it, and extorted from the od thro' Fear of the King, as he ſays, *ibid.* it is more than what the Biſhop of *Rome* himſelf juſti-, if we may believe *Binius*, who in his Notes n this Council of *Senlis* tells us, That *Hincmar* obtain'd a Confirmation of the 3d Council of *ſons*, (which had depoſed the ſaid *Rothard*) tho' ·eptitiouſly. How a Matter of this Moment ld be done ſurreptitiouſly, I cannot conceive. , granting it to be done ſurreptitiouſly, it ıgs no ſmall Diſgrace upon the Infallibility of Pope. To ſet this Affair right therefore, let onſult *J. Sirmondus*. He tells the Truth of the tter indeed, but ſeems to relate it from *Hinc-* himſelf, in theſe Words: Hincmar *tells us, That uncil of ſeveral Biſhops defended his Cauſe againſt* hard *in an Epiſtle to Pope* Nicolas, *which* Flo-rd *mentions in* Lib. III. cap. 12. *I have long born b him,* (ſc. Rothard) *tho' not without great Con- for the Souls committed to his Care; and when I d bear no longer, I brought him before a Council of ıops, that he might hear them; whom he would not r, but demanded Judgment againſt me. Lab. T.* 8. '61. And to make this Contempt of *Rothard*'s re plain, *Labbé*, in the Third Council of *Soiſ-*, quotes the *Bertinian* Annals to the Year 861, heſe Words: Hincmar *Archbiſhop of* Rhemes, *in rovincial Synod, excommunicated* Rothard *Biſhop of* ſſons, *for his Diſobedience to Eccleſiaſtick Rules.* that tho' his Crime is not truly known, yet he ırr'd the Sentence pronounc'd by the Synod for Contempt. *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 736. But to return he Quotation of *J. Sirmondus* out of *Flodoardus*. is Quotation implies a Crime in *Rothard*, for ich he had incurr'd the foreſaid Sentence. And

as to his Appealing to *Rome*, it is no more than what Pope *Nicolas* put into his Mouth; for in his 33d Epistle to *Rothard*, he advises him, if they will not let him go to *Rome*, not to fail to appeal to the Apostolick See. But the foresaid Quotation shewing so much of a Crime as was implied in *Rothard*'s Contempt, the Editors endeavour to obviate it, by charging *Hincmar* with Ingratitude, Disobedience, *&c.* in two Epistles subsequent to the Council of *Senlis*, and this Note of *Sirmondus* with the Quotation. These two Epistles, *Labbé* saith, were sent him from Cardinal *Barbarini*, by whose Command they were transcrib'd from the Papers of the famous *Lewis Holsten*. The First of these Epistles is written in the Names of *Theutgand*, *Gunthar*, and *Arduicus*, to *Hincmar*, who seem to reproach him with Ingratitude to one *Hilduin*, formerly his Tutor and Governor. The Second is from the same, and two more to the Bishops of *Belgic Gaul*, *&c.* concerning *Hincmar* and *Rothard*. I must confess, I cannot readily believe that these Epistles are genuine, for these Reasons: First, *Theutgand* and *Gunthar* were Primates, and in those Times the Primates and Bishops of those Countries insisted on their own Rights, and would not acknowledge that Exorbitancy of Power which the Bishop of *Rome* sometimes claim'd. Besides, the Council of *Antioch*, whose Canons the Second Epistle quotes, are directly against the Subject Matter of the Epistle, which all along blames *Hincmar* for Obstinacy and the Scandal that this Treatment of *Rothard* had brought upon the Church. But these Canons, which they quote from this Council, make no Way for them; the Sixth Canon, in the Case of any one excommunicated by a Bishop, will not allow any Appeal beyond a Synod: And for any Resort to the Emperor, the Eleventh and Twelfth

Ca-

already said, was a severe Persecuter of them
the Score of *Lotharius*'s Divorce, treacherously
ving them to *Rome*, and there confining them
ard; which could not be said of *Hincmar* to-
Rothard, for he often summon'd him to plead
mself, and to clear himself of the Charge
ginst him. Thirdly, I must confess these
les carry no Date in themselves; but being
l immediately after the Council of *Senlis*,
h was *A. D.* 863. and the Top of the same
bearing the same Date, I cannot conceive
wise than that it was intended they should
bear the Date of that Year, which was the
Year that Pope *Nicolas* treated *Theutgard* and
lar so unhandsomely at *Rome*. These Incon-
icies, with the usual Practice of the Editors
iming a Plausibility upon a Fiction, make me
much suspect them upon all Occasions; and
such apparent Proofs of Disingenuity, I think
ought to be well look'd after. But notwith-
ling the Editors so furiously condemn *Hinc-*
yet I cannot find that Pope *Nicolas*, or any
is Successors, in whose Pontificate *Hincmar* liv'd,
ed him with any Disrespect: nay, they gave

Right of Calling and Convening Synods was solely in him, but acquiesces in *Hincmar*'s Disposal and Management. I could Instance in many others of this Pope's Epistles to *Hincmar*, which are all very respectful; but let this suffice. However, the whole Affair between *Hincmar* and *Rothard* must by the Consequence turn upon this, that tho' *Rothard* was afterwards with much Difficulty and Entreaty restor'd, (for it cost Pope *Nicolas* many an Epistle both to King *Charles*, *Hincmar*, and the *Gallick* Bishops) yet *Hincmar* all this while incurr'd no Censure, nor does the Bishop of *Rome* pretend to any Threat, or any Thing like it; from whence it is plain, he had acted nothing irregularly, and that the Pope at that Time had no coercive Power over him. Pope *John* VIII.'s Hundred and first Epistle is as high an Encomium of *Hincmar* for his Piety and Learning as Words can express. In short, *Hincmar* was a Man of an unexceptionable Fame, which created him an universal Esteem in his Life-time, and after his Death, as *Baronius* *An.* 882. *n.* 7. witnesseth; and as no Man understood the Canons and Rights of Church better than himself, so no Body did more bravely defend them.

We come now to the Story of *Hincmar* the Uncle, Archbishop of *Rhemes*, and *Hincmar* the Nephew, Bishop of *Laon*. The Nephew was the Son of *Hincmar* of *Rhemes*'s Sister, brought up under his Uncle. When he was of Age capable of Preferment, he was by his Uncle promoted, and by his Means made Bishop of *Laon*; under which Character he behaved himself for some Time with a Deference becoming a Suffragan to a Metropolitan, and a Nephew to an Uncle. But he soon forgot his Duty in both, for he held an Abbey in another Province without consulting his Uncle;

for

for which being frequently ſummoned to a Synod, he would not obey, entertaining Perſons excommunicated by his Uncle and other Biſhops, and excommunicating People of another Dioceſs. Nor did he ſtop here, for he aſperſes his Uncle's Character with moſt unmannerly Reproaches, declaring him unworthy of the Character he bore, and threat'ning that he would have him degraded. This Carriage ſoon qualifies him for a Rebel to his King, for he endeavoured to make a Defection in *Charles*'s Subjects to the Emperor *Lotharius*; and at laſt, being impatient at the Slowneſs of his Affairs, he aſſumes the Civil Sword, and defends his wild Decrees by Force of Arms, depriving thoſe of their Goods whom he had depoſed. But that which gave him a more ſpecious Pretence of being troubleſome, was a certain Mannor formerly taken from the See of *Laon*, but by King *Charles* reſtor'd to *Hincmar* at his entring into the Epiſcopate, and afterwards by *Hincmar* deliver'd to the King, that he might beſtow it upon one *Norman*, a certain Courtier. This very Mannor *Hincmar* the Nephew demands, excommunicates *Norman*, and with an armed Force, not only takes Poſſeſſion of the Mannor, but deprives *Norman* of all his Goods. And not content with this, he accuſes *Norman* to the *Pope* as a Thief and Sacrilegious Perſon. Hereupon the Pope ſends to Archbiſhop *Hincmar* to excommunicate Count *Norman*; who underſtanding the true Cauſe of the Quarrel, wiſely refuſes it; nor would King *Charles* any Way liſten to it. *Hincmar* of *Laon* frets at this, and accuſes his Uncle and the King to the Pope of Sacrilege, and Contempt of the Apoſtolick See. About the ſame Time happen'd an Addition to this Feud, for *Hincmar* the Nephew, upon a very ſlight Occaſion, had excommunicated all the Clergy of his Dioceſs.

They appeal to their Metropolitan old *Hincmar*, Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*, who abſolves them from the Cenſure, and reſtores them to Communion and Function. *Hincmar* the Nephew ſtorms at this, threatens every Body, contemns a Synodical Summons, and openly excommunicates the King, Biſhops and Nobility. But his good old Uncle interpoſing, the King conſented to a Rehearing of theſe Things in a Synod; and in the Year 869, a Synod being called at *Wermeria*, and *Hincmar* of *Laon* not able to anſwer or clear himſelf of the Charge objected to him, thinks to evade all by appealing to the Pope. But the King and the Metropolitan would not be ſo put off. He is impriſon'd by the King, and the Year following, in open Synod, is by his Uncle and Metropolitan accus'd of Rebellion to his Sovereign, Contumacy to his Metropolitan, Injury to Count *Norman*, unjuſt Excommunication of his Clergy, and of Tyranny to his Lay-Subjects. After this he ſo manag'd the Matter with the King and his Uncle, that obliging himſelf by Oath to ſtand to the Determination of three Biſhops, whom his Uncle ſhould chooſe Judges in theſe and other Caſes, he moſt perfidiouſly flies from his Agreement, and appeals again to the Biſhop of *Rome*, who at that Time was called

[867.] *Adrian* II. a great Friend and Patron of Rebels, and Encourager of other Irregularities in the Church. But to go on with the Affair of the two *Hincmars*. Pope *Adrian* eſpouſes his Caſe with the greateſt Ardour, uſing both Entreaties and Threats with the King and old *Hincmar* in his Behalf. And tho' *Hincmar* of *Laon* openly took Part with *Charlemain*, then in Rebellion againſt the King, yet the Pope continues a ſtrenuous Patron and Aſſerter of his Intereſt. But to put an

End

End to this Feud, in the Year 871, a Council was called at *Dieuze*, in which *Hincmar* of *Laon* is accus'd by the King and his Uncle of several Crimes, where not being able to make any Defence, notwithstanding his Appeal to *Rome*, and denying the Power of his Judges, he is by the unanimous Consent of the Synod condemned and deposed. I believe it scarcely possible for any Man to paint a Churchman in blacker Characters, than does the Story of this very *Hinchmar* of *Laon*, and yet such a Man as he is thought worthy to be the Minion and Favourite of the Bishop of *Rome*, tho' stigmatiz'd with those black Crimes of Rebellion and Schism. This Council of *Dieuze* is very tenderly handled by the Editors. *J. Sirmondus* barely relates the Summons *Hincmar* of *Laon* received from his Uncle to appear before the Synod; and *Binius* (who must be meddling, tho' to no Purpose for, the Pope's Advantage) says the same Thing; adding moreover the Form of the Oath which *Hincmar* took to the King and his Uncle; *viz. I* Hincmar, *Bishop of* Laon, *will be faithful and obedient to my Sovereign Lord King* Charles, *according to my Function, as a Man ought to be to his Sovereign, and Bishop to his King. I likewise promise I will be obedient to* Hincmar, *Metropolitan of the Church of* Rhemes, *according to the Holy Canons*, &c. This *Binius* tells out of *Aimoinus*; but to soften it, he adds, That *Hincmar*, for Fear he should be condemned by the Bishops, appealed to *Rome*; to which he was prevented going by the King and *Hincmar* for some Time. *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 1541. Here it is worthy observing, that tho' *Hincmar Junior* did appeal to *Rome*, and that being stop'd, the Pope wrote to the King and Archbishop *Hincmar* often, to let him come to the Apostolick See, and purge himself there, and likewise that his Accusers should appear there; yet the Pope could

not gain his Point, either in getting *Hincmar* to *Rome*, or prevent the Sentence of the Synod against him. Nor do I find him threatning or domineering either over the King or the Archbishop, but writing generally in a very friendly and supplicant Style, especially when he is to gain any Thing; as his Epistles in Behalf of the Emperor *Lewis* written to *Hincmar*, to use his Interest with King *Charles* that he would not invade the Empire. But there was more in it than what has hitherto been observ'd; for tho' the Editors, both in the Title and Argument of this Council of *Dieuze*, leave out whom this Council was called by, and the President of it, and, according to their usual *Blind*, say in such a Year of such a Pope, (who must be set before the King) and such a King; yet, according to their celebrated *Lewis Cellot* the Jesuit, and *Flodoard*, *Hincmar* Archbishop of *Rhemes* was President here, whom the Pope knew to be so exact in Point of Discipline, and skilful in the Laws and Canons of the Church, that he could not in Reason find Fault with him. And besides, he was a Prelate of true Christian Courage, and so bold an Asserter of Truth, that the Bishop of *Rome* had Reason to fear an Overmatch. But he never attempts any Thing with *Hincmar* by Threat, as is said already. And considering the State of Affairs about that Time, I do not find that the Bishops of *Gaul* recogniz'd the Bishop of *Rome* any otherwise than as a Brother Bishop, treating one another with the Title of *Holiness*, which was always customary both in the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches; but for any Power in calling or nulling Councils, rescinding Decrees, and the like, the *Gallican* Church was very jealous. This is plain from the Synodal Epistle of the Fathers of this Council to Pope *Adrian*, wherein, after they have acquainted him with the Irregularities

ties and Crimes of *Hincmar Junior*, they desire his Consent and Confirmation, (not as the Editors would persuade, as if no Decrees were firm without the Bishop of *Rome*'s Sanction, but as was always usual for Sister Churches to confirm each others Decrees) and that *Hincmar* might not be reconcil'd or restor'd till he had retracted his Opinion, obliging the Pope to observe this Canonical Determination, which was never yet deny'd to the *Gallican* Church. I have but few Observations to make in this Pope's Pontificate, and then shall proceed to the next. In the Life of this Bishop of *Rome* it is expresly own'd, that the Emperor *Lewis* approv'd of the Election of *Adrian*: Which is a new Sort of Turn given by Design of the Editors; for the Word formerly used to be *Confirmation*; but to soften the Harshness of the Term, and lessen the Power that Word carry'd with it, they now call it *Approbation*. *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 884. But to give the Reader an Opportunity of making an honest Observation here, I will transcribe the Passage: *The Most Christian Emperor* Lewis, *hearing the unanimous Consent, (viz.* of the *Romans) was very glad, and writing to the* Romans, *commends them for their Choice of so worthy a Person. From whence* (says this Author) *it plainly appears, that there was no Reward promis'd to any one upon his Consecration.* This is downright begging the Question, and I cannot see for what Reason this ridiculous Inference is made, but to let the World know such Practices had been too often used in the Promotion of the *Roman* Pontiffs, who ow'd their Possession of the Papal Chair more to the Power of Gold than the Recommendation and Divine Influence of the Giver of all good Gifts.

In the Subscriptions to the Council of *Dieuze* lately mentioned, there are Eight Persons who sub-

ſubſcribe in the Names of abſent Biſhops. The Terms are promiſcouſly uſed, ſometimes, *ad Vicem Domini & Patris mei*, and ſometimes *Vice Patris mei*, which are the ſame, and do plainly imply, That the Perſons ſubſcribing did ſubſcribe in the Room of their Natural, and not Spiritual Fathers; for if they had ſubſcrib'd for them as Spiritual Fathers, they would have made Uſe of ſome Eccleſiaſtick Recognition, as *Sanctiſſimi, Reverendiſſimi Patris, &c.* From whence I conclude Biſhops were married in thoſe Times.

The Irregularities of this Pope are a great Argument againſt his Infallibility. He was a great Friend to, and ſtrenous Promoter of the Intereſt of *Ignatius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* before-mentioned, who upon his Reſtoration to his Patriarchate, ſends *Photius*'s Book, which he wrote againſt Pope *Nicolas* and the Church of *Rome*, which *Adrian* cauſes to be burnt, and lays a triple *Anathema* on *Photius* in a Synod held at *Rome* in the Year 868.

But this Dearneſs laſted not long, for *Ignatius* rouzes the old Quarrel about the *Bulgarians*, of which Pope *Adrian* complains, but to no Purpoſe. *Ignatius* inſiſts on the Rights of his Patriarchate, baniſhes the Biſhops and Presbyters ſent from *Rome* into *Bulgaria* from thence, and claims that Province as a Part of his Diſtrict. But of this more in Pope *John* VIII.'s Life.

After *Adrian* had written many Epiſtles to King *Charles* in Favour of *Hincmar* of *Laon*, in his Thirty third he laments the King's Contempt of the Apoſtolick See, diſapproves *Hincmar* of *Laon*'s Depoſition, and commands that he be ſent to *Rome*, in order to have his Sentence revers'd. The King returns a ſharp Reply to this, which ſo ſtung the Pope, that he writes again to the King, and by a long Encomium in his Praiſe, endeavours to appeaſe

peaſe him ; calls him, Defender of the Church at preſent, and promiſes him a happy Eternity with the Saints: Aſſuring him likewiſe, that he will act nothing contrary to the Council of *Nice*, and the Decrees of other Councils, in the Caſe of *Hincmar*. *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 937, 938. So that notwithſtanding all the thundring Threats of the Biſhop of *Rome*, it cannot be found that *Hincmar* of *Rhemes* receded from any Part of the Sentence or Sentences which had paſs'd againſt his Nephew in the ſeveral Synods to which he had been conven'd; nor is it any where to be found among the Epiſtles of Pope *Nicolas* I. or *Adrian* II. who both patroniz'd *Hincmar Junior* and his Cauſe, that either of them ſo much as threatned old *Hincmar* for proſecuting his Nephew, and their Favourite, or that he took ſo much Notice of their Epiſtles as to obey that Part of them wherein they oblige *Hincmar Junior* and his Adverſaries to appear at *Rome*, and ſtand to the Deciſion of the Pope. And though *Cabbaſutius* is not ſparing in throwing Dirt on old *Hincmar*, calling him proud, obſtinate, contumacious, *&c.* *p.* 351, 352, *&c.* yet from the Editors themſelves I dare juſtify this good Man, and ſhew him the Reverſe of what that Author is pleaſed to make him, and that from *Adrian*'s immediate Succeſſor,

[872.] Pope *John* VIII. who notwithſtanding the Infallibility of his Predeceſſors, diſapproves what they had done, by approving what old *Hincmar* of *Rhemes* had done in the Caſe of his Nephew of *Laon* in the 314th Epiſtle of this Pope to *Hincmar* Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 221. Which being ſo poſitive and direct a reſcinding of what had paſs'd before, and likewiſe a Confirmation of old *Hincmar*'s Proceedings, may be no unpleaſing Entertainment; and therefore I inſert the whole Epiſtle as it is in *Labb.* aforeſaid.

CCCXIV. *To*

CCCXIV. *To* Hincmar *Archbishop of* Rhemes.

That there may be a Bishop ordained to the Church of Laon *in the Place of* Hincmar.

John, Bishop, and Servant of the Servants of God, to *Hincmar* Archbishop of *Rhemes*.

THough we do not in the least question your Holiness's Judgment; yet because our most beloved Son, the invincible Emperor Charles, *having inform'd us concerning the Sentence pass'd by your Holiness and Brethren the Bishops against* Hincmar *Bishop of* Laon, *we acknowledge it to be just. For we do not believe so great a Prince would affirm any Thing but Truth; and therefore esteem it a Sin not to believe him.*

Defer not then to fill the vacant Church of Laon *with a fit Person. At which Election we would have the Emperor's Ambassador be present, to prevent any Secular Tumult. We wish your Holiness Health in Christ.*

This Epistle bears Date *A. D.* 876. which was the Year after *Charles* the *Bald* was anointed and crown'd Emperor at *Rome* by Pope *John*; in Pursuance of which, says *Sirmondus* in his Note on this Epistle, (notwithstanding Pope *Adrian* had disapprov'd of *Hincmar Junior*'s Deposition) about three Month's after *Hedenulf* is chosen Bishop of *Laon*.

Return we now to that Part of the Story of *Photius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, which relates to this Pope. *Ignatius*, as has been said, being restor'd to the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, differs with his Friend Pope *Adrian* II. about the Business of the *Bulgarians*, whom *Adrian* claim'd as Subjects to the See of *Rome*; which same Quarrel is reviv'd between

tween Pope *John* VIII. and *Ignatius*, the former of which ſends his Legates to the Emperor *Baſilius* and *Ignatius*, for the Recovery of that Province to the See of *Rome*, threatning them with *Anathema's* upon their Refuſal. This was *A. D.* 878. in which Year *Ignatius* dies, and *Photius* is reſtor'd, who, by the Command of the Emperor *Baſilius*, the Year following calls a Council at *Conſtantinople*, wherein *Photius*'s Reſtoration is ratified, and all former Proceedings againſt him null'd and abrogated. Things going thus in Favour of *Photius*, Pope *John* by his Legates at this Council, enters into an entire Friendſhip with *Photius*, which the firſt Canon of this Council ratifies, Pope *John* condemning all whom *Photius* had condemned, and *Photius* the ſame. Thus we ſee, what one Pope makes a flagrant Schiſm, another makes an Act of Communion; ſo that at the beſt, allowing their Infallibility, it can be no more than temporary, and dies with the Perſon.

If the Adverſaries of the Pontificate had ever ſo deliberately ſtudied to inſtance in two Men, whoſe Eminence of Character in Piety and Learning had render'd them ſuperlatively great, they could not have pitch'd upon two ſuch as *Hincmar* of *Rhemes*, and *Photius* of *Conſtantinople*, in that Age; whoſe Lives make ſo conſiderable a Figure in Story, as few *Roman* Pontiffs ever yet arriv'd to. Nor was the Intereſt of *Hincmar* in his Time (though not a Patriarch) inferior to that of the Biſhops of *Rome* his Contemporaries; for he upon all Occaſions gave a Check to that Exorbitance of Power which the Biſhop of *Rome* too often aſſumed and aſſerted. Witneſs his Book againſt the *Proedrian Papæ*, or Preference of the Pope, in *Leo* IV.'s Time. *Helvic. p.* 118.

But

But to make an End of the Story of *Photius*; let us look among the Epistles of Pope *John* VIII. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 130,131. and so on. In the CXCIXth Epistle of Pope *John* to *Basilius* and *Alexander* the Emperors, the Editors, under the Title, puts an Argument suitable to the Epistle, which begins thus: *Being mov'd* (that is, Pope *John*) *with the Entreaties of the Emperors to restore Peace to the Church of* Constantinople, *he dispenses with* Photius, *that he should be put into the Place of* Ignatius, &c. This is their Way of begging the Question, but they will find it very difficult to prove what they in the Argument assert, there being no Epistle extant among them (I mean the Editors) from the Emperors to the Pope in the Case of *Photius*: Besides, *Photius* was reconcil'd to the Emperor *Basilius*, and restor'd to his Patriarchate, before he and Pope *John* were made Friends, and received each other's Subjects to Communion. This Epistle is a strange Sort of *Medly*; for, as the Editors have publish'd it, it speaks in the Interest of both Patriarchates, which we will examine as they occur. *Labbé*, in the Margin, *p.* 130. tells us, that the Places corrupted by *Photius* are mark'd throughout the Epistle. The First Note is upon a Passage in the Beginning, which *Labbé* says (*ibid.*) is left out by *Photius*; and is thus: After great Compliments for the high Respect the Emperors of *Constantinople* ever shew'd the See of *Rome*, he adds, *and submitted all Things to her Authority*. This, says *Labbé*, *Photius* in his Translation leaves out. But considering how celebrated, even by his Enemies, *Photius* was for his Piety and Intregity, and how infamous the *Roman* Editors have been for Disingenuity and Imposture, I doubt not but all honest Men will look upon this Passage as a Forgery of their own. The next is in *p.* 131. where they charge *Photius* with changing

of Names, and altering the Sence. Pope *John* directly, according to this Copy, charges *Photius* with *Usurping* the Office of Patriarch, because he had not acquainted him with it. Now I would know, when it was the Emperors of *Constantinople* called in the Bishop of *Rome*, either to elect or confirm the Election of a Patriarch of *Constantinople*. This Passage of Usurpation, *p.* 131. *Labbé* says, *Photius* has changed into a contrary Sense, by saying, he was forced by the Emperor to accept of this See. Which is very probable, for *Basilius*, who first made him Patriarch, and afterwards deposed him, had a great Esteem for him, he at that Time outshining the Age in the most conspicuous Qualifications. His illustrious Birth, his great Skill in Canon and Civil Laws, his Prudence and great Penetration in all Manner of Learning, were such as recommended and endear'd him to the Emperor. *Nicet. in Vit. Ignat. p.* 1198. And tho' he deposed him, and recall'd *Ignatius*, yet the Remembrance of his great Abilities soon recover'd him the Emperor's Favour, who was reconcil'd to him, and restored him to his Patriarchate. This was done without the Pope's Knowledge or Consent, who was never allow'd any Right or Claim in the Choosing or Creating a Patriarch of *Constantinople*; and consequently there could be no Usurpation in *Photius*. The same Page and the next contain nothing else but an Acknowledgment from *Photius*, and begging Pardon from the See of *Rome*, which in the Margin they say *Photius* in his Copy has left out, as likewise the Absolution which Pope *John* pretends to give him and his Adherents for all past Misdemeanors. These Passages carry no Face of Credibility with them; for they look more like their own Vanity than any Omission of *Photius*. In the 133d Page, *Labbé* seems to call his Infallible Guide to Account in the Margin, say-

saying, *This is too large an Encomium on* Photius. This Encomium is little more than an Exhortation, wherein he advises the Emperor to pay *Photius* the Reverence becoming a Spiritual Father, *&c.* and therefore *Labbé* need not have been so sparing of a Character and good Advice from the Bishop of *Rome.* It is worth while to observe *Binius* in his Notes on this Epistle; for here we discover a very inauspicious Blunder of his, and for which his Friend *Labbé* in the Margin condemns him. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 134. Where he says, *As concerning the Occasion of Pope* John's *writing an Epistle for the Absolution and Restitution of* Photius, *see the Notes on the Life of Pope* John VIII. But here, *ibid. p.* 2. *Labbé* contradicts him in the Story of his crowning Three Emperors, telling us in the Margin, *Binius* is very much mistaken, particularly about *Lewis the Stammering.* But this Note of *Binius* in the Page aforesaid, makes Pope *John* a very scandalous Person in the Case of *Photius,* whose Character the Editors are resolved to eclipse, tho' they ruine the Pope and his Infallibility too; for the Note taxes him with foul Crimes. Photius *having fraudulently dealt* (says *Binius*) *with the Emperor and the Patriarch of* Jerusalem's *Legates, is at their Importunity with the Pope, after the Death of* Ignatius, *received into the Communion of the Church, not without great Loss of Reputation to the Patriarchal See, and heavy Scandal to the Pontifical Chair; the Pope, with the rest of the Council at* Constantinople, (*which the* Romans *falsly call the Eighth General Council*) A. D. 869. *having constituted and sworn not to admit* Photius *to Penitence to his Life's End.* The Pope that took this Oath we must suppose to be *Adrian* II. However Pope *John* VIII. breaks through it, and makes no more of his Predecessor's Oath, than the Editors do of Forgery; which the Notes express (in my Opinion) very foully. *The Pope,* (say they) *neither ignorant of this*

most

most Sacred Constitution, nor unmindful of the Oath, instead of admitting a stubborn Heretick to Penitence, and restoring him to a Patriarchal See, should have anathematiz'd him: But, (says *Binius*) *through the Intercession of the Emperor* Basilius, Photius *obtained his Restoration, &c.* If *Binius* be in the Right, 'tis certain the Pope was in the Wrong; for he did receive *Photius* into Communion, anathematizing whom *Photius* anathematiz'd. The Beginning of the Epistle to *Basilius*, *Leo* and *Alexander*, *Labbé*, *T.* 8. *p.* 134, *&c.* tells us, is wholly alter'd by *Photius*. But if this were alter'd by *Photius*, Why do they insert it? And why do they not produce those true Copies of these Epistles which the Notes so highly extol, *ib. p.* 134. as being by the great Providence of God preserv'd in the Register of *John* VIII. and not destroy'd, as the Epistles of many Popes have been; but were preserv'd so entire, that out of them, as likewise out of Pope *Nicolas* and *Adrian*'s Epistles, *Photius* may be often convicted of Forgery and Imposture. But this is affirming, not proving; for, as has already been hinted, let them sum up all the Virtues and good Acts of these Three Popes; and the Figure which *Photius* made in the *Eastern* Church, will far outshine theirs. I shall for Brevity-sake omit several Passages which they pretend *Photius* inserted in his Translation instead of the Originals, and shall conclude with this, *viz. Oramus, &c. ib.* 139. "We beseech your Imperial "Majesty." This they do not like, and therefore *Labbé* in the Margin says, *Photius* chang'd the Word *Mandamus* into *Oramus*, and put in, *The most Holy Patriarch Photius*, instead of *Ignatius*, *ibid.* But this is most preposterous and absurd: For the subject Matter of this Epistle relates wholly to *Photius*'s Restoration; therefore *Ignatius*'s Name must very improperly be foisted in here. But whatever in

this Epistle looks favourably on *Photius*, they endeavour to discredit, especially *Binius*, who is very scurrilous, calling *Photius* most profligate, impious Impostor, *&c.* But he cannot say worse of an *Eastern* Patriarch than he does of the *Western* in that Respect; for, as has been before observ'd, he makes Pope *John* none of the best of Men.

The CCI. Epistle of Pope *John* VIII. to *Photius*, looks like a Piece of Concert in Favour of the Bishop of *Rome*, whose Patriarchate the Editors would have to overtop the World. *ibid. p.* 143. Pope *John* asserts the Right of the See of *Rome*, *viz. In the Promotion to a Private See, We ought to have been consulted before-hand.* Which Words imply, that in the Case of *Photius* he was not consulted; so that their own Words make against them. But *Labbé*, in the Margin, endeavouring to expose *Photius* for an Impostor, tells us, That *Photius* had nothing of *Consulting the Apostolick See* in his Copy. So that the Imposture turns upon themselves; for with Impartial Judges, the Reputation of the Editors cannot stand in Competition with the Integrity of *Photius*.

The next Passage in this Epistle that is remarkable, is that of *Photius*'s begging Mercy in a Synod. This the Editors put down for granted, it being demanded by the Pope, say they, *ibid. p.* 143. according to Custom. Adding further, that the most Christian Emperor *Basilius* having with much Importunity interceded for him, he and the rest had unanimously consented to his Restoration; withal promising Pardon and Communion to him upon his humbling himself in a Synod. These Passages, *Labbé*, *ibid.* tells us, are quite left out by *Photius* in his Copy; and if he had said they never had been in, he had utter'd a more proper Truth. For, in the first Place, they ought to prove in what

what Council this Submission either had been or was to be made, which the Editors never used to forget, when any Thing made for the Advantage of their great *Diana* the Pontificate. But this being not proved, they must excuse the Reader's Incredulity till they can shew some Authority, either in the Acts and Canons of some Council, or in some Historian of good Reputation.

The next Article is of the same Piece with the former, and which *Labbé* in the same Margin says was cut off by *Photius*. This was concerning the Province of *Bulgaria*, which Pope *Nicolas* I. had claim'd as his own, which of Right ow'd Canonical Obedience to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*. This Province, *Ignatius* (tho' Pope *Nicolas* I. and he were great Friends, being both Promoters of Image-Worship, *&c.*) had reassum'd, and possess'd in Pope *Nicolas* I. and *Adrian* II.'s Time, nor did *Photius* quit the Claim to it; and therefore an Epistle is sent by Pope *John* VIII. to him, to forbid any further Pretences of the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* to that Province, upon Pain of Excommunication. *Binius*, in his Notes on this Epistle, is pleased to be as scurrilous as usually, charging *Photius* with knavish Dealing in his Translation of this Epistle into *Greek*, by adding, substracting, mangling, and expunging what he thought fit, and then caused them to be read in his Sham-Eighth General Council. But this is like him. However he may rail at *Photius*, to advance the Greatness of the Patriarch of *Rome*, he will find, that Pope *John* VIII. made no greater Figure at that Time than other Patriarchs: And tho' he calls this Synod of *Constantinople* a Sham-Synod, yet he ought to consider, (if it was a Sham-Synod) it was such a Sham-Synod as the Pope at that Time countenanc'd by his Legates; who, notwithstanding the

Infallibility of his Predeceſſor, by reſcinding the Acts of that *Roman* Council under *Adrian* II. and that *Conſtantinopolitan* Council under *Ignatius* againſt *Photius*, ſhews to the World, that Popes are as fallible as other Biſhops. The Patriarchs of ſeveral Parts of the *Eaſtern* Church, by their Legates, were at this Council for reſtoring *Photius*; as thoſe of *Alexandria*, *Jeruſalem*, *Antioch*, *&c.* who wrote Epiſtles to the Emperor and *Photius* too, threat'ning Anathemaes to thoſe who did not recognize *Photius* as their lawful Patriarch; all which, bating the Deference to the Patriarchate of *Rome* as the Firſt See, had equal Concern as to Power or Pre-eminency in this, or any other Synod where their Legates appeared.

The CCXXXI. Epiſtle of Pope *John* VIII. to King *Charles*, is written in the moſt humble abject Style imaginable, and argues a Power of the Secular Prince in Eccleſiaſtick Affairs, which the Editors at other Times will not allow. Where the Church indeed is incroach'd upon by the Civil Power, it is not to be excus'd; but when Patriarchs, *&c.* ſhall pretend to a Power in another Patriarchate or Province, which they dare not exerciſe within their own Diſtrict, I am ſure he muſt be look'd upon as a very inconſiderable Governor in that Diſtrict; and conſequently muſt be eſteem'd inſignificant, if not ridiculous, in another Province. A very plain Inſtance we have of this in Pope *John* VIII. if we may believe the foreſaid Epiſtle. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 166. The Occaſion was this: The Pope had made *Conſpert* Biſhop of *Verceil*, to whoſe Ordination the King had conſented; and as for *Anſpert* Archbiſhop of *Milan*, whom the King would have abſolv'd, Pope *John* moſt humbly remonſtrates why he could not do it. *We give your Majeſty* (ſays he) *very many Thanks that you have*

have given us free Liberty in the Affair of the Bishoprick of Verceil, *to which by Decree of the Synod we have ordained* Conspert. *But as for* Anspert *Archbishop of* Milan, *as you commanded, we ought not to reconcile him without due Satisfaction, therefore beseech your Goodness to give us no Trouble therein, being very willing in all Things to obey your Will.* This is a Style very unlike that of the Popes of *Rome*, who in a more impatient Manner afterwards were used to threaten Damnation to all that oppos'd them. But here Pope *John* was afraid of a Reprehension from the King for proceeding without his Knowledge; which, by the Way, was an Argument of a very abject Spirit in that Case: Nor was the Command, which the King had laid on him, any Thing less; for if *Anspert* by his Irregularity had incurr'd the Censure of his Metropolitan, Patriarch, or a Synod, and was under any Sentence, without his Submission and Satisfaction, the King's Commands could not take off his Sentence; and therefore Pope *John* was in the Right to decline the King's Command, tho' the Style and whole Bent of the Epistle too plainly shews the fearful Apprehensions the Pope had of the King.

The Editors say very little in this Pope's Praise, whereas usually they were wont in the Account of their Lives to extol them in the highest Panegyricks imaginable. But here, in *Labb. T. 9. p. 1.* there are but three short Paragraphs in all, the last of which makes his Holiness but a very indifferent Casuist. The Story is thus: *Adalgisus* General of *Beneventum* having gotten the Emperor *Lewis* in his Power, the Emperor takes an Oath, never to enter the Territory of *Beneventum*, nor to take any Revenge for the Injury then offer'd him. From this Oath the Pope absolves him by the Authority of God and St. *Peter*; affirming, that an Oath taken

to save his Life was of no Force; nor could that be called an Oath which was against the Good of the Commonwealth, tho' bound with ever so many Execrations. In his Pontificate likewise the *Saracens* over-ran *Naples*, and that Part of *Italy*, up to *Rome* it self; insomuch that the *Neopolitans* and *Beneventines* were forced to make a Peace with the *Saracens*; which the *Neopolitans* refusing to violate, he threatens them with Excommunication. The like he did to the People of *Malfi* in *Italy*, to whom he wrote an Epistle. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 172. Let the Condition or Occasion of an Oath be what it will, there ought to be a very tender Regard had to Men's discharging themselves from it: For where God is in so solemn a Manner call'd to Witness to the Intentions of Man's Heart in so deliberate an Act, the Person thus obliging and engaging himself to a just Performance of his Oath, ought to be very well assur'd, that that God whom he invok'd be well satisfied with the Authority that pretends to discharge him from such a Sacred Obligation.

Among the Councils that were held in the Pontificate of *John* VIII. that of *Ravenna*, *A. D.* 877. is remarkable for several Things, besides the good Canons that were therein constituted. This Council was called by the Pope, and he was present at it, tho' the Editors in the Title do not, as usually, say it was under such a Pope; but that the *Synod of* Ravenna *was held by* 130 *Bishops*. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 299. But after the Canons of this Council there immediately follows a Diploma, which *Labbé* in his Note on this Council says, must necessarily be granted by the Bishops assembled in this Council. And the Matter is plain; for in the Beginning it says, *That in the Year* 877 *the Bishops met at* Ravenna, *being called by the Authority of the Pope and Emperor, in which*

which Synod Pope John *presided.* But instead of subscribing to the Canons and Acts of this Council, the Bishops subscrib'd only to the Diploma, among which Pope *John* is first. Now, considering the Artifice of the Editors in Things of this Nature, we may more reasonably expect this to be a Design than an Omission in them: For the Pope being President of this Council, sitting in Person, and subscribing to the Canons, they may be apt to think, it calls in Question several of their irregular and uncanonical Practices in later Ages. The Fourth Canon decrees the Clergy and Religious to be under the Tuition of their Bishops, which is very opposite to the Practice of Exempts, who pretend themselves independent of Episcopal Jurisdiction, and pay no Allegiance to their Diocesan. The Fourteenth Canon is founded upon the Thirty sixth Apostolick Canon, which says, *That every one that is ordained Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, shall undertake a Cure, or be suspended till he doth.* But this Canon saith, *It is necessary that a Priest be ordained to a Church.* By Parity of Reason then, if it be requisite that a Priest be ordained to a Cure or Church, much more that a Bishop be, whose Charge is of greater Extent, and whose Dignity is superior, and who cannot be a Bishop before he is a Priest; How then is the Practice of creating Bishops in the very Cradles, and Abbots (who likewise ought to be Priests) before they are Priests, to be justified? That there are such Things is plain from Experience, in most Countries that acknowledge the Papacy; and the Space of Time is scarce to be call'd Years, since a Bishop of the Church of *Rome* was ordained a Priest, who had been for some Time before a Bishop of the Church of *Rome*, and an Elector of the Empire. Now, for these Reasons, I am apt to think the Editors thus slightly passed

over the Pope in the Title, neither owning him there as President of it, as usually they do, (nay generally where he had nothing to do) nor annexing the Subscriptions in their proper Place to the Canons, but at the End of the Diploma.

In the Year 878, a Council was held at *Neustria*, upon a Complaint of the Emperor *Lewis* III. against *Hugh* the Bastard-Son of *Lotharius*, who at the Head of a tumultuous Army, after the Death of *Charles*, had invaded and laid wast great Part of *Lewis* Country. Here was a fair Opportunity for the Prelate of the First See to have shewn himself in Defence of an injur'd Prince against a lawless bold Invader. But the Pope is not so much as mentioned in all this Council, except in the Title; where it is only said, *In the Time of Pope John* VIII. not under him. Besides, from the Editors themselves it is plain, that they thought the Business lay properly within their own Country, and among themselves; and therefore a Synod being summon'd, old *Hincmar* of *Rhemes* was President of it, by whom the Synod exhorted *Hugh* the Invader to Peace. *Labb. T. 9. p. 306. Hincmar* of *Rhemes*, as has before been observ'd, was the Oracle of the *Western* Church in his Time, for his great Skill in the Canon-Law, which no Bishop understood better, or more bravely defended; and none of the Bishops of *Rome* who knew him, ever pretended to reverse the Canons or Decrees of any Synod where he presided, without a Reprehension which always justify'd his Proceedings. But in this Case, which was National, and wherein there was a most manifest Violation of Right, by an illegitimate Invader, the Bishop of *Rome* offer'd not to meddle; whether it was because he knew nothing of it, or whether he thought he had nothing to do in it, I will not pretend to determine.

This

This Pope was present at the Second Council of *Troyes*, *A. D.* 878. upon this Occasion: *Lambert* Count of *Spoletum* having taken *Rome*, Pope *John* flies into *France* to entreat Succour. At which Time in this Synod he complains of the sad and heavy Oppressions the Church of *Rome* labour'd under through the Cruelty of Count *Lambert* and others, demanding their Concurrence in the rooting out this Evil. The Synod demand Time to consult of the Expediency of this Affair, least they should proceed irregularly, (for old *Hincmar* of *Rhemes* was there) who in Behalf of the rest of the Bishops answers the Pope; *That according to the Holy Canons, &c. whom the Holy Mother Church of* Rome *condemned, they condemned; whom she anathematiz'd, they anathematiz'd; whom she received, they received, &c. Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 307. This Answer was like that Christian Hero *Hincmar*; who no doubt had well weigh'd the Heinousness of *Lambert* and his Confederates Crimes, that had given so much Disturbance to the Church, before he gave it. In the Proem to the first Act of this Council, there is something that carries a Face of Forgery with it, and foisted in by some Body to make this appear a General Council, which neither the Editors in the Title own, nor in any Part of the Council. But this besides was to colour the true Cause of the Pope's coming into *France*, which, as has been said before, was to beg Aid of King *Lewis* against Count *Lambert*, *&c.* But in this Proem they tell us, *That the most Holy Father Pope* John *came into* France *to ease that Church of the several Oppressions it labour'd under.* Which could not be at that Time, or any thereabout; for the *Gallican* Church seldom found Disturbance then but from some Bishop of *Rome* or other, who too often sided with rebellious Bishops and Clergy, that flew in the Face of their Me-

Metropolitans and Princes; as has been obſerv'd in the Caſe of *Rothard* and *Hincmar* of *Laon*. But that which deſtroys this Sham-Story of the Cauſe of the Pope's coming into *France* is, that in the firſt Act of this Council, in the ſubſequent Paragraph to this Proem, the Editors make the Pope himſelf tell quite another Story; for there he complains only of the Oppreſſions which *he* ſuffer'd by ſome perverſe Men, and deſires the Concurrence of the Synod in the Cure. *ib. p.* 307. As to the Preſidence in this Council, or the Calling of it, neither are mention'd by the Editors in the Acts of it, or in the Title, which only ſays, *It was celebrated in the Year* 878, *in the Sixth Year of Pope* John VIII. *and the Firſt of* Lewis *the Stammering. Ib. p.* 306. Nor is it mentioned in the Subſcriptions, the Pope only ſubſcribing Firſt, as Prelate of the Firſt See, a Preference always allow'd to the Biſhop of *Rome*. But there is nothing ſaid of the Preſident of it, not even by *J. Sirmondus* in his Notes on it. 'Tis certain, at the Council of *Ravenna* he preſided in Perſon, and if he had preſided here, I am apt to think the Editors would not have omitted it. In this Council was *Hincmar Junior* reconciled, and in Part reſtor'd to the Church of *Laon*; being as it were a Coadjutor to *Hedenulf*, whom old *Hincmar* had put in his Nephew's Place, and at the Inſtigation of this very Pope, as has been ſaid already. But this Reconciliation was not without old *Hincmar*'s Conſent, for his Name is among the Subſcriptions of this Council. *Labb. Ib. p.* 313.

[882.] *Martin* II. ſucceeds Pope *John* VIII. whoſe Pontificate laſted few Days beyond a Year; therefore little is to be expected from him in that Time, the moſt remarkable Actions of his Life being before he was Biſhop of *Rome*. I ſhall take Notice of one, becauſe it contradicts another of the

the same Nature in a former Pope, which is still Buffeting their Infallibility. *Labbé, T.* 9. *p.* 356. in this Pope's Life, tells us, That this *Martin*, in the Time of *Adrian* II. was join'd in Legateship with *Donatus* and *Stephen* to depose *Photius*, and restore *Ignatius* to the See of *Constantinople*; and that he presided in that Synod, which the *Latins* call the Eighth General Council. This is very improbable, for tho' *Ignatius* concurr'd with the Patriarch of *Rome* in Image-Worship, yet he was as jealous of the Rights of his own See as the Bishop of *Rome* could be; witness, his asserting and claiming the Obedience of the *Bulgarians*, which the Pope had unfairly stolen from the See of *Constantinople*. As to the Actions of this *Martin* in his Legateship, the Editors and Historians of their own Party can make no more of it than this, *viz.* That if Contradiction be a Note of Infallibility, no Church in the World could ever show more of it than that of *Rome*; for, according to their own Accounts, *Martin*, in Commission with *Donatus* and *Stephen*, did depose *Photius*, and restore *Ignatius*; whereas *Rodad* and *Zacharias*, Legates of the very same Pope *Adrian* II. had before subscrib'd to the deposing *Ignatius*, and investing *Photius* in the Patriarchate. Likewise in Pope *John* VIII.'s Time this *Martin* was sent a Legate to *Constantinople* to repair the Mischief which the three preceding Legates, *Peter*, *Paul* and *Eugene*, had occasion'd in the restoring *Photius*. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 356. So that there is little Certainty in the *Romish* Infallibility at this Rate; but less according to *Labbé* in the next Page; where he says, That Pope *Martin* rescinded those Acts which Pope *John* had rashly done; (*perperam egerat*, are the very Words) one of which was his restoring *Formosus* Bishop of *Porta*, whom Pope *John* had deposed, and had sworn never to restore, *ibid.* And a few Lines further says,

ſays, *For what Cauſe he was depoſed by Pope* John, *or after what Manner reſtored by Pope* Martin, *is not plain: But however he could abſolve him* (i. e. Formoſus) *from his Oath, which had been unjuſtly extorted from him, and retract that illegal Sentence of Pope* John, *which perhaps was pronounc'd out of ſome private Grudge.* Here is a heavy Charge againſt the Supreme and Infallible Guide and Judge! No leſs than unjuſt Extortion of an Oath, illegal Sentence, and Prejudice. It's well this Author ſpoke at ſome Diſtance of Time from this Pope, who, I believe, would not have ſhewn him more Mercy than he did Favour to *Formoſus*. Indeed, this is ſuch a Concuſſion of their Infallibility as is not commonly to be met with. I have but one Obſervation more on this Pope, and then ſhall leave him. What falſe Steps of his Predeceſſor Pope *John* he had diſcover'd after his Death, we ſee from the Editors in Part; but how Pope *Martin* his Succeſſor ſhould be ſo ſevere upon his Memory I cannot conceive, except it was for his irregular and uncanonical Proceeding in conſecrating him *(Martin)* a Biſhop, but to no See. *Lab. ib. Cav. Hiſt. Lit. Par.* 1. *p.* 565. This was indeed a Ground of Prejudice to an impartial, orthodox, canonical Perſon, but the Perſon ordained of all Men ought to be ſilent. *Vid. ſupra*, in the Life of Pope *John* VIII. about the 14th Canon of the Council of *Ravenna*, *& Can. Apoſtol.* 36.

[884.] *Adrian* III. ſucceeds *Martin* II. in whoſe Pontificate there is nothing memorable, but the old Quarrel about *Photius*, which *Adrian* proſecutes with great Zeal and Fury. This Feud the Emperor *Baſilius* endeavours to reconcile; but *Adrian* carries his Reſentment ſo far, as to treat *Photius* no otherwiſe than a Layman; which ſo incenſed the Emperor, that he writes a thundering

Let-

Letter back: But *Adrian* in the mean Time dies, and leaves the Quarrel to his Succeſſor

[885.] *Stephen* V. who anſwers the Emperor in as lofty Terms as he wrote; but the Emperor dies, and his Son *Leo* receives it, who ſides with the Pope againſt *Photius*, whom he forthwith depoſes, and confines to a Monaſtery, where ſoon after he dies. There are Three Epiſtles ſaid to be written by this Pope, of which the laſt looks very ſuſpicious, as *Labbé* owns, *T.* 9. *p.* 374. for it ſpeaks of *the moſt glorious Emperor* Odo, and of the Pope's coming to the Council of *Troyes*. Now who this *Odo* was, and of what Place, Emperor, is not to be found about thoſe Times, and is juſt as true as Pope *Stephanus*'s going to the Council of *Troyes*; the lateſt of which Councils of that Name was near Seven Years before he was Pope. But this Epiſtle, tho' never ſo falſe in its Chronology, ridiculous in its Nature, and even ſuſpected by themſelves, yet muſt be inſerted if it ſpeak any kind Thing of the Pontificate's Supremacy or Infallibility; and that it does plentifully; for here Pope *Stephen* would make *Selva*, to whom he writes, believe, That the ſole Diſpoſition and Determination of all Things Eccleſiaſtick are veſted in him.

In the Year 888, a Council was held at *Mentz*, without the Conſent or ſo much as Knowledge of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and upon ſo conſiderable and important Occaſions as thoſe of chooſing a King, and regulating the State of the Church, at that Time very much diſorder'd. This *Binius* owns in his Note on this Council, *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 411, 412. and that *Luitbert* the Archbiſhop preſided in it. The Biſhop of *Rome* is in no Part of this Council mentioned; the Subſcriptions being left out, or loſt; I cannot ſay which. Tho' this is to be obſerv'd, that in thoſe Councils where the Pope preſided, or at leaſt was preſent, as in thoſe of *Ravenna* and the

Se-

Second of *Troyes*, he ſubſcribes firſt. But neither Pope nor his Legate being there, *Binius* lets it paſs that *Luitbert* the Archbiſhop preſided. As to the Diſtinction which *Binius* makes in the ſame Note between the Titles of Emperor and King, it is very vain and groundleſs, and makes the Character of him true, that he will be doing tho' to no Purpoſe, or very often to do Miſchief to his own Cauſe. He ſays there, *That* Arnulphus *was by all ancient Writers called King, and not Emperor; becauſe it was not allow'd to any one to aſſume that Name, except it was given them by the Pope. ib.* He might as well have ſaid, the Pope firſt inſtituted the Title of Emperor: For *Lewis* the Firſt and Second were called Kings of *Germany* as well as Emperors, and the Office of Coronation, whether perform'd by Archbiſhop *Luitbert* or any other Biſhop, was as valid as if done by the Biſhop of *Rome*. *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 360. is of the ſame Mind with *Binius*, as taking it from him. But if we look a little forwarder into the Reign of this King *Arnulph*, we ſhall find, that the Words, Emperor and King, were ſynonimous Terms; and this is more plain in the Third Canon of the Council of *Tribur* near *Mentz*, *A. D.* 895. where the King in his Anſwer uſes both in one Senſe; *aliter Regnum & Imperium Jure Eccleſiaſtico regere & gubernare non poſſumus.* Which Words, if they had implied any Difference, would have been diſtinguiſh'd by the Diſjunctive *aut* or *vel*, inſtead of *&*.

[890.] *Formoſus* next aſcends the Papal Throne, whoſe Life was one continued Series of Miſery, and who after his Death was ſuch an Inſtance of poſthumous Cruelty as is not often to be met with in Hiſtory. By Pope *Nicolas* he was ſent a Miſſionary to inſtruct the *Bulgarians*, newly converted to the Faith, where he behav'd himſelf anſwerable to the Character he bore. And notwithſtanding the Daubings and Flattery of Sycophants, the good

Man appears in much of this Pope's Life: Which makes some of his Successors look very black, whose barbarous Resentment against this Pope, both before and after his Death, hath brought so lasting a Stain and Reproach upon their Memories, and even their belov'd Infallibility, that the most studied Artifice of their Adversaries could not have exceeded. To prevent any Contradiction, we will take their own Words. In the Life of this Pope, *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 427, *&c.* after the short, but due Encomiums on his successful Apostleship to the *Bulgarians*, the Author proceeds to vindicate him, by a severe Censure on Pope *John* VIII. "Who, to "his great Dishonour, envying the good Deeds "of his Predecessors, (*viz. Nicolas* I. and *Adrian* II.) "receives *Photius*, and *Zachary* Bishop of *Anagnia*, "the Legate, into Communion, whom those two "Popes had condemned, and deposes good *Formo-* "*sus*, whom he reduc'd to a Layman, and banish'd "the City, obliging him by Oath never to return "to his Bishoprick of *Portua*, but to be content "with Lay-Communion only." This some People would be apt to call a very arbitrary Way of Proceeding in the *Infallible Guide*; but the Chair cannot err do what it will, tho' the Author in the following Words gives it a violent Shock; for, says he, "For what Reason Pope *John* was thus "incens'd against *Formosus*, is not plain, except it was "for reprehending and admonishing him for his "wicked Actions; which Pope *John* might look "upon as a Sort of Rebellion, and therefore ras'd "his Name out of the Catalogue of Bishops." This is a great Diminution of Pope *John*'s Infallible Judgment, that could not discern between a Christian Admonition, and Rebellion. But he goes on: "*Martin* succeeds Pope *John*, who weighing "the Merit of the Man, raises him from this Dis-

"grace,

" grace, abſolves him from his Oath, (extorted " from him by Force) and reſtores him to his for- " mer Dignity." Thus we ſee one Pope undoes what another Pope does, and yet they muſt be accounted Infallible.

By Reaſon of ſeveral Elections and Coronations, in which this Pope had ſo much intereſted himſelf, the Citizens of *Rome* were ſo prejudic'd againſt him, that he enjoy'd neither Eaſe nor Peace among them. " As to the Injuries and Diſgrace, " *ſaith my Author*, which *Stephen* VI. and *Sergius* III. " either ignorantly or maliciouſly offer'd to this " Pope, we ſhall ſpeak more of in the Life of *Ste-* " *phen* VI." To which Time I ſhall with him refer a further Account of this unhappy Pontiff; only let the Reader obſerve the Terms this Author charges upon his Infallible Judges, no leſs than Ignorance and Sacrilege.

We come next to a famous Piece of Forgery father'd on this Pope; in vindicating which, the Editors, eſpecially *Baronius*, have run themſelves into an inextricable Error; and which, by endeavouring to mend, they make worſe. They take the *Engliſh* Council, called by King *Edward Senior*, in which *Pleigmund* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* preſided, from *Malmsbury*; who ſays, it was called by the King, upon Account of the Excommunication which Pope *Formoſus* had publiſh'd againſt both King and Kingdom. In this Council it was agreed, That the vacant Biſhopricks ſhould be fill'd, and *Pleigmund* ſent to *Rome* with the King's Submiſſion and great Preſents. Whereupon *Pleigmund* returns with an Epiſtle from Pope *Formoſus* to the Biſhops of *England*, and is by him conſtituted Apoſtolical Legate. As to the Times of King *Edward*'s Reign, and the Pontificate of *Formoſus*, they are altogether irreconcileable; for according to *Regino Ab-*

bas, *Luitprand*, and *Cabbasutius*, (who stretch his Life out the longest of any) *Formosus* enter'd on the Pontificate in the Year 890, and with his Life, quitted it Six Years and Six Month after; whereas King *Edward* began his Reign not till the Year 901. Sir *Henry Spelman* proposes an Expedient to heal this Mistake. *Concil. T.* 1. *p* 389. *by supposing the Name of* Leo V. *to be inserted instead of* Formosus, *which would set all right.* And indeed if it could be prov'd from Authority, not Conjecture, it would reconcile all. This Conjecture *Cossart* rejects, by introducing one more improbable, *Labb. & Cossar. T.* 9. *p.* 432. " For, says he, if the Name " of *Formosus* were to be expung'd, Pope *John* IX. " ought to be put in his Room." It is certain King *Edward* reign'd in *England* from the Year 901, and during several Pontificates; but it is very doubtful whether Pope *John* the Ninth sat longer than the Year 899. *Baronius* lays the Blame, and that by Conjecture too, of this Mistake on the Librarian. But *Cossart*, to close all at last, says, if instead of altering the Name of the Pope, we would change the Name of the King, and put *Alfred* for *Edward*, then the Difficulty would be solv'd, and all Things reconcil'd. But this is no more than Conjecture, and till they can produce some good Authority to justify their Chronology, I do not conceive my self or any Reader oblig'd to believe their History. Whoever would see more of this, let him consult *Papebrochius's Conat ad Chronol. Rom. Pontif.* *p.* 156. who calls the Second Epistle of Pope *Formosus* a downright Forgery of the 11th Century.

[896.] *Sergius* & *Boniface* (whom *Cabbasutius* calls the Sixth) gave great Disturbance to poor *Formosus*, the latter of which at last depos'd him, and thrust himself into the Chair; but *Stepha-*

nus VI. soon dispossesses him by Force. This the Editors call succeeding, *Stephanus Sextus successit Formoso, &c. Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 474. It's a Wonder they did not call it Election too, or soften it with some tender Epithet, as *Forceable Choice, &c.* Truly to give them their Due, they do not; and yet they come pretty near it, for *p.* 475. *ib.* they say, *All the Clergy approv'd it, and the whole Catholick Church acknowledg'd him Christ's Vicar, and Successor of St.* Peter. And yet the same Author, in the very antecedent Line, calls him *(sc. Stephen* VI.*)* the most wicked of Men; and tells us, he is reckon'd in the Papal Catalogue to prevent the Danger of Schisin. Now considering the high Qualifications of these two Competitors, *Boniface* VI. and *Stephen* VI. I cannot see how the Catholick Church could be in Danger of a Schism more by one than by the other; for both were Invaders, and did not stick to ravish this Holy Diadem from another, whether rightful Possessor or no; only *Stephen* depos'd an Intruder, whereas *Boniface* usurp'd on a lawful Bishop. And yet the Author, *p.* 474. *ib.* calls *Boniface, Homo nefarius* only; but *p.* 475. *ib.* he calls *Stephen, Homo scelestissimus.* And truly, considering the subsequent Actions of *Stephen*, he was a most monstrous Wretch; for in the Year 897, he calls a Council at *Rome*, at which Pope *Formosus*, tho' dead and buried, must appear; therefore being most unnaturally dug up, he is dragg'd to the Council, where being plac'd in the Pontifical Chair, he is divested of the Holy Garments, having three of his Fingers cut off, with such other inhumane Treatment as this Butcher could afford, his Body was thrown into the *Tyber*, and all his Acts rescinded. But my Author goes further still, *ibid.* He falls foul on *Onuphrius*, in his Annotations on *Platina*, for rejecting this barbarous Story as fabulous, which

which is confirm'd by ſo good Authority as *Luitprand* and others. He then aggravates the Crime of Pope *Stephen*, ſaying, he added Sin to Sin, by giving a Sanction to his Wickedneſs in a Synod; that the very Stones would curſe him, and that it were better he were ſton'd than that the Church of *Rome* ſhould be depreſs'd by ſuch a Scandal; that the Pope's chief Palace in the *Lateran* fell to the Ground, as not being able to ſtand, when the chief Stone of its Corner was ſhaken by ſo horrid a Fact. But at laſt, ſays he, the Hereticks of our Age, not without Reaſon, reproach us with this wicked Act of that *Sacrilegious Pontiff, ibid. But yet, tho' Pope* Stephen VI. *was ſo wicked a Man, they ought not to inſult us againſt the Promiſes of Chriſt made to St.* Peter *and his Church; for all that* Stephen *ſaid or did againſt* Formoſus, *were meer Acts of Frenzy or Fury; but as he was lawfully inveſted with the Pontifical Authority, he could not err againſt the Faith and good Morals, ib. p.* 476. How they can call Pope *Stephanus*'s forcible Entrance on the Pontificate a legal Inveſtiture, I cannot conceive; for he was at beſt but an Intruder on an Intruder and Murderer; and becauſe he was wanting in the Part of the Murder of Pope *Formoſus* living, he goes as far as Poſſibility can allow, and butchers him after his Death. Thus Murder is good Morals, and Uſurpation and Invaſion, if they ſucceed, make a legal Inveſtiture; which muſt be afterwards approv'd, and the Perſon, tho' a moſt unnatural Monſter, be acknowledg'd Chriſt's Vicar and St. *Peter*'s Succeſſor. But Divine Vengeance ſoon overtook this Pope, for in the Year 900, he is thrown into Priſon, where he was quickly after ſtrangled. There are two Epiſtles tack'd to this Life, the laſt of which is to the Archbiſhop of *Narbon* in *France*, complaining of the great Privileges the *Jews* enjoy'd among them.

This Epistle was first publish'd by *Catellus* in his Commentaries of *Septimania*, and attributed to Pope *Stephen* VI. tho' by some it is suppos'd to be *Stephen* VIII.'s, by others, *Stephen* V.'s. But be it whose it will, or ascrib'd to whom, is no Matter, the End for which it was either truly written or forg'd is plain, *viz.* To shew the Power of the Supream Judge, tho' the most execrable Wretch be in Possession of the Chair.

In the Year 897, a Synod was called at *Rome*, in which, as is said before, it was resolv'd to dig up *Formosus*'s dead Body, throw it into the *Tyber*, and rescind his Acts; for which Fact the Pope and his Complices are call'd by the Editors, and especially *Baronius*, (from whom they take the Words) *Homines perditissimi, & Pontificiæ Sepulturæ Violatores. Baron. An.* 897. *n.* 6. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 478. This I look upon to be a Sort of Miscarriage in the *Infallibility*; for certainly he must be very loose, nay most profligate, and void of all Principles of Morality and Christianity, who by such execrable Crimes must deserve the Epithets of *Most Wicked*, and *Violator of the Grave*. The Editors discover their Partiality in this Council in the Title; for, in the first Place, they call it *Conciliabulum Romanum*; whereas at other Times, and on other Occasions, they never talk of a *Roman* Council, but they tell you that it was *Concilium*, and not *Conciliabulum*; and that it was held, as well as call'd, by such or such a Pope; whereas in this there is no Mention of Pope *Stephen* VI. not so much as in the Title. How obscure soever they would have it, Pope

[898.] *John* IX. in the Year 904, in a Council at *Rome*, damns all the Acts of *Stephen* VI. against *Formosus*; and in another the same Year at *Ravenna*, of 74 Bishops, he confirms all *Formosus*'s Ordinations, condemns his Predecessor *Stephen* VI. and his

Roman Council, restoring those *Stephen* had deposed, and deposing those he had ordained, at the same Time paying a due Veneration to the Memory of Pope *Formosus*. But the Council of *Rome* in the Seventh Canon, the most absolutely of any, strikes at the Infallibility in these Words: *For since what was done in the foresaid Council* (*i. e.* in the *Roman* Council under *Stephen* VI.) *was contrary to Canonical Authority, by a general Consent let it be burned.*

Sirmondus opposes the Editors very strenuously about the forementioned Council of *Ravenna*; making it out, that the Canons which they pretend were made at the Council of *Ravenna*, were made in the First *Roman* Council of this Century. *Labb. T.* 9. *in Append. p.* 1237. But let these Canons be made in which Council they please, they detract very much from the Papal Supremacy; and plainly shew they come short of the Arrogance of the more modern Pontificate in Temporals. The First Canon excommunicates all Violators of Canons, and Holy Decrees of the Fathers and Emperors. This is from the Pope and the Synod. The Second and Third, which confirm all Privileges granted to the Church and her Clergy, and prohibit all Invasions and Incroachments from the Laity, are enjoined by the Emperor only. The other Seven, which are wholly applicatory to the Emperor for Redress of Grievances, are penn'd in the most supplicating Style that can be; as is plain from Can. V. VI. VII. VIII. IX. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 509.

[906.] This Year Pope *Leo* V. succeeds *Benedict* IV. from whose Pontificate proceeded a Series of Invasion and Usurpation. *Leo* sat but Forty Days, for being thrust out of the Pontifical Chair by *Christopher*, he is cast into Prison, where the Editors leave him. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 515.

Pope *Christopher* enjoys not this ill-gotten Honour long; for after Seven Month's Space, he is by *Sergius* deposed, bound, and cast into Prison; Soon after which he is compell'd to take up with a Monastick Habit and Life. *Christopher* and *Sergius* III. are both called Invaders of the Holy Apostolick See by the Editors, *ibid.* but especially *Sergius*, in whose Life they are not sparing of Invectives, *ibid. p.* 517. calling him, *A Slave to all Vice, and the most villainous of Men.* And yet, notwithstanding this black Character, with the Addition of his invading and obtaining the Papacy by Fraud and Force, they say and affirm this can be no Prejudice to the Church; for that such Popes as these are in the Sence of the Church to be call'd Apostates, and not Apostolick. I grant, that the Wickedness of Man ought not to be esteem'd a Prejudice to the Church; and I question not in the least, but the wise Providence of God permits wicked Governors both in Church and State for some great and good End. But when I read the History of such wicked Men as *Christopher* and *Sergius*, *&c.* painted in so black Colours as all the Malice of Man cannot exceed, tho' I allow their wicked Actions affect not the Church and Faith of *Christ*, yet they must excuse me if I allow not such notorious Sinners the Title of *Infallible*; for after all their Subterfuges, tho' the Church cannot fail, I am sure such Governors may, because I know they have fail'd, as has been egregiously made manifest. But this is with Design to obviate and take off a greater Scandal; which we shall hear more of in the Pontificate of Pope *John* X.

In the last Year of *Sergius* III.'s Pontificate, *viz. A. D.* 909. *Herivey* Archbishop of *Rhemes*, and his Suffragans, held a Council at *Trosso* in *Tuscany*; where, upon the Foot of the ancient Canons of both

both the *Eastern* and *Western* Churches, they constituted Fifteen excellent new ones relating to Ecclesiastick Discipline. But I do not find that Pope *Sergius* had any Thing to do in this Council, either by himself or Legates, tho' it was so near him; for the Title plainly tells us, *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 510. that, *It was celebrated by* Herivey *and his Suffragans in the Time of Pope* Sergius, *&c.* and by the Subscriptions, in which *Herivey*'s Name is first, neither the Pope nor his Legate's Name being underwritten, I cannot see who but *Herivey* call'd and presided in this Council. Had it been otherwise, the Editors would not have spared to let us know, either in the Title or Subscriptions.

There is one Passage very remarkable in this Pope's Life, and which plainly manifests, that if Infallibility were to be supposed inherent to Persons or their Character, the Patriarch of *Constantinople* had a better Claim, considering his Proceeding, than Pope *Sergius* III. Of whom, though the Editors speak many foul Things, yet they leave this Story out of his Life; *viz.* That when the Emperor *Leo*, sirnam'd the *Wise*, had married a Fourth Wife, *Nicolas* Patriarch of *Constantinople* refused to confirm the Marriage, as being contrary to the Canons, and a particular Constitution of this very Emperor; and not only depos'd *Thomas* the Priest that married them, but excommunicated the Emperor himself. For which, and his resolute persisting in the Sentence he had pronounc'd, he is confined to a Monastery. This Story is more at large in the Epistle of *Nicolas* to the Pope, *Labb. T.* 9. *in Append. p.* 1264, *&c.* wherein he expostulates with him about the Injustice of the Action, and complains of the Pope's Legates, who join'd with the Emperor's Party in Confirming this Marriage. So that how foul and scandalous so-

ever this Marriage was, (for which I refer the Reader to that Epistle, which makes it bad enough) it is plain, that what Patriarch *Nicolas* refused as irregular and uncanonical, Patriarch *Sergius* never refus'd; (for he it must be, according to *Baronius*, who dispens'd with the Emperor in this hopeful Match) tho' this Epistle of *Nicolas* is not directed by Name to any Pope, only in General to the Pope of Old *Rome*. It may not be unworthy the Reader's While to cast an Eye upon one Part of this Epistle, *ib. p.* 1266. which relates to the Irregularity of this Marriage, and in which the good Patriarch, with an honest Freedom, blames the Practice of the *Western* Church, which allows too great a Latitude in often marrying. " There are " not wanting those, says he, who, to colour their " Error, call this Matrimony, and not Fornication. " But can the impure Associating with a Fourth " Woman be called Matrimony? And is it not of- " fering the greatest Violence to Words to cloak " such foul Lasciviousness with so honest a Name? " St. *Paul* says, *Marriage is honourable, and the Bed* " *undefiled*: Why then do the Holy Canons cast " those out of the Church who dishonour it? " And why do they call such doing, brutal Lust, " and exceeding the Bounds of humane Nature? " And yet, if we may believe Report, this is the " Custom of the *Romans*, who, by Vertue of an " inexhaustible Stock of Dispensations, allow Men " to take a Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, or as many as they " please, basely perverting that Saying of the Apo- " stle, *It is better to marry, than to burn*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 9. " making him a Patron of Lust and Incontinence, " who does not so much as persuade all People to " marry, when he saith, *To the unmarried and Wi-* " *dows, it is good for them that they abide so; but if* " *they cannot contain, let them marry*. *ib.* 89. But this

" Per-

"Permission for Widows to marry again, is in "Consideration of the Weakness of their Sex, but "is not allow'd to Men. For, if a Fourth Mar-"riage were allowable, why does *Clement*, the "Disciple and Hearer of St. *Peter* so openly con-"demn it, in these Words: *First Marriage is conso-"nant to Nature and the Law, Second Marriage after "Promise is unlawful, Third Marriage argues Inconti-"nency; and what exceeds the Third, is direct Fornica-"tion. Lib. Apocryph.* But the Offender here is not "a Subject, but a Sovereign, whose Will must not "be contradicted. Very fine! Must therefore "they that excel in Dignity excel in Wickedness? "By the same Reason, we ought to neglect the "Head to take Care of the Feet, *&c.*" Throughout this Epistle there is an Air of true primitive Christian Courage, that durst speak the Truth in the Face of Kings, tho' Ruine was the certain Consequence of it, and reprove the *Western* Patriarch for his irregular Practices in the Case of Marriage; which Reprehension he seconds with the Authority of *St. Paul*, and *Clement* his Disciple.

[910, 912.] *Anastasius* III. and *Lando* make but a poor Figure among their Brethren; only *Lando*, at the Instigation and Importunity of a famous Courtezan, makes *John*, a Presbyter of the Church of *Ravenna*, and her Minion, Bishop of *Bononia*, and soon after Archbishop of *Ravenna*: For which *John* quickly rewards him, for, by the Help of *Theodora* the Courtezan, he deposes *Lando*, and thrusts himself into the Pontifical Chair, by the Name of

[913.] *John* X. tho' by the Editors at the same Time call'd Sham-Pope, confederate with a Strumpet, and Invader of the Holy See; yet, after an infamous and long Invective against his scandalous Familiarity with this *Theodora*, they tell us, that

Pope

Pope *John* being very much troubled in Conscience for his past wicked Life, sends to *Sisenand* Bishop of *Compostella*, to desire him to pray to St. *James* to pray to God for him; adding in the Margin, That the Acts of Pope *John* make it appear, that he was not confirm'd in the Pontificate till after Pennance: So that by this we are to believe, That the Infallibility does not commence upon the Consecration of a Pope, but upon his Confirmation. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 570. This is such a Fetch, as nothing can be more ridiculous. But how infallible soever they are pleased to call their Pontiff, I am sure from their own Accounts, they are guilty of very gross Mistakes and Irregularities, and which by Custom and Practice have grown into confirm'd Precedents. We have before taken Notice of creating Bishops in the Cradle; and here, in this Pope's Life, we have another Instance; for in the Year 926, he by his *Diploma* confirms *Hugh*, the Son of Count *Herbert*, a Child of Five Years of Age, Archbishop of *Rhemes*; which Custom, as has been already said, has been too strictly observ'd, and prevails in those Countries that profess the Church of *Rome* to this Day. And what less can be expected from so hopeful a Precedent as this infallible Guide. But it is Time to leave this Heap of Scandal. After he had held the Pontificate Sixteen Years, it pleased God out of his very Sin to raise an Instrument of his Punishment; for *Wido* Marquis of *Tuscany*, at the Persuasion of *Marozia*, (who had been formerly the Prostitute of *Sergius* III. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 571.) deposes him, and throws him into Prison, where not long after he was strangled. Thus, say they, *p. ibid.* as an Invader and unjust Detainer of the Apostolick See, he received a Reward worthy of his Wickedness; and as by the Means of a lewd Strumpet he violently

aviſh'd the Holy See, by the Means of another Strumpet, and Daughter of the former, he receiv'd his Reward. *Luitprand, Flodoard, Baronius.*

Hitherto in this Century the Church had put on but a melancholy Aſpect, all her Affairs running into Diſorder and Confuſion. Few learned Writers adorn'd this Age, and there was ſcarce a Council held about any Thing of Moment, or worthy Remembrance. Horrid Schiſms defac'd the Church, and the deteſtable Lives and Acts of the Popes brought much Scandal and Diſgrace on the Chriſtian Commonwealth. So that *Baronius, ad An.* 900. n. 1. might juſtly call this the *Unhappy and Obſcure Age.* However, what we find in our Way worthy of noting we will ſet down.

During the Pontificate of *John* X. which was 16 Years, there were but Seven Councils held, and thoſe were in *Germany*, in none of which is this Pope mentioned. In the Second Council of *Troſſo, A. D.* 921. *Herivey* preſided, who had excommunicated Count *Hertbald* for ſeveral Outrages: Who dying under this Sentence, at the Importunity of the King the Sentence is remitted. *Seulfus* the Archbiſhop preſided in the Third Council of *Troſſo, Flodoard. Chron. An.* 924. and the Fourth Council of *Troſſo* was called by Count *Heribert*: So that neither in the Title or Body of any of theſe Councils is Pope *John* X. named. If they urge in Defence of this, that being only a *Pſeudopope*, as the Editors call him, *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 569. they would not ſet him at the Head of any Council, I would know why they do not expunge him out of the Catalogue of Popes? I know their only Anſwer to that muſt be, That ſuch a Vacancy as the Space of 16 Years would make a wide Gap in their Succeſſion, which muſt not be; and therefore to prevent that, they will ſupply it at any Rate, tho' with the moſt profligate

ſligate Wretches. Undoubtedly thoſe few good Governors of the Church that lived in this barren Age, could not but abhor ſuch deteſtable Monſters as *Sergius* III. *John* X. *&c.* and therefore did not communicate any Affairs of the Church to them; from whom they could expect no Good.

[929.] *Leo* VI. had ſcarce ſat a Year when he was depos'd, and thruſt into Priſon. Pope *Stephen* VII. who ſucceeded him, ſat two Years; but there's no more ſaid of either by the Editors.

[931.] The next that takes the Chair is one whom they ought to call a Devil, inſtead of Pſeudopope; and yet he muſt be inſerted in the Catalogue of the Popes; though, according to their own Confeſſion, the vileſt, blackeſt Monſter that ever yet defiled the Holy Purple. This was Pope *John* XI. Son of Pope *Sergius* III. by the Strumpet *Marozia*, (a bleſſed Stock to take an Infallible Guide from!) by whoſe Means he was intruded into the Place of *Stephen* VII. though, beſides all other Impediments, he was incapable of that high Office in the Church through Want of Years. This Pontificate was a Series of Debaucheries, Inceſt, *&c.* which would offend the modeſt Reader to repeat: At the End of which, Divine Juſtice purſues the Cauſe; for *Alberic*, another Son of *Marozia*, routs his inceſtuous Father-in-Law *Hugo*, takes his Mother *Marozia* Priſoner, and his Brother *John* the *Pſeudopope*, whom he confines in Priſon; where, after he had defil'd, not govern'd, the Apoſtolick See for near Five Years, he expir'd. *Lab. T. 9. p.* 591.

[936, 939, 943.] As for the Three next Popes, *viz. Leo* VII. *Stephen* VIII. and *Martin* III. the Editors ſay ſo little of them, that it is ſcarce worth while to mention any of them. I ſhall therefore paſs to

[946.] Pope

[946.] Pope *Agapetus* II. of whom the Editors say as little as of the former. There is only this Obſervation to be made, that to ſhew his Infallibility, in the Caſe of *Hugo* and *Artald*, Competitors for the Archbiſhoprick of *Rhemes* in the Year 947, he declar'd for *Hugo*, and in the Year 948 he confirms *Artald* in the Archbiſhoprick.

[955.] The Life of Pope *John* XII. begins with as unlucky a Step as any of the former. *Lab. T. 9. p.* 640. It tells us, that due Age, and all other Qualifications requiſite in a lawful Pope, were wanting in him; yet, notwithſtanding theſe Deficiencies, to prevent a Schiſm in the Church, he is by the General Conſent of the Clergy choſen Pope. His Want of Age was Objection ſufficient of it ſelf againſt his Election, for he was not full Eighteen, which was very uncanonical. He was a Man of ſuch profligate Morals, that he left nothing unattempted that might ſerve his Luſt or Ambition; for either for Murder, Adultery, or Tyranny, he might diſpute Precedency with *Nero* or *Caligula*. And to crown theſe impious Qualifications, he was ungrateful, treacherous, and perfidious to the higheſt Degree: For, after he had unſucceſſully made War with *Pandulph* Prince of *Capua*, and that *Berengarius*, without Diſtinction, had invaded and waſted *Italy*; upon his Application to the Emperor *Otbo* for Aid, he received ſuch Aſſiſtance as ſoon quieted *Italy*. The Emperor having thus ſucceſsfully freed *Italy* from Invaders, repairs to *Rome*, where he is magnificently received and entertain'd. The Emperor, in Return for this, confers vaſt Preſents and Gifts on the Church, beſides the Addition of ſeveral Cities, together with the Confirmation of all the Privileges of the *Roman* Church. Upon this, the Pope and all the Nobility of *Rome* ſwear upon the Body of St. *Peter*, That they would ne-

never take Part with *Berengarius* and *Adelbert* against him. And thus the Emperor departs quietly for *Papia*; where he had not long been, but Pope *John*, forgetting his Oath, revolts from the Emperor, and joins with *Adelbert*. But the Emperor no sooner approaches *Rome*, than Pope *John* and *Adelbert* quit it; at which Time, says *Luitprand*, the Citizens received the Emperor and his Army into *Rome*, and swore Fidelity to him; adding moreover, (and that upon Oath, that they would never hereafter choose any one Pope without the Consent and Approbation of the Emperor and his Son King *Otho*. Three Days after a Synod is called, and *Leo* VIII. is made Pope in the Room of *John* XII. who, upon the Emperor's Departure, returns, deposes *Leo* as an Invader and Intruder into the Holy See, and rescinds all that was done by his Adulterer (as he calls him). There was no less than Three several Councils called at *Rome* upon this Occasion. The First was called by the Emperor *Otho*, *A. D.* 963. wherein *John* is deposed, and *Leo* put in his Place. The Second was called by *John*, *A. D.* 964. in which *Leo* is deposed and condemn'd as a Schismatick. The Third was called the same Year by the Emperor, in which *Leo* recovers the Pontificate, at which Time Pope *Benedict* V. was in Possession of the Chair, but is deposed and banish'd to *Hamburgh* by *Leo*, where he dy'd in Exile. The Author of the Lives of the Popes in *Labbé* indeed does not take any particular Notice of *Leo* VIII. by himself, only speaking of him *in transitu*, in the Lives of Pope *John* XII. and Pope *Benedict* V. So likewise does *Cabbasutius*, *Regino Abbas*, and others. But considering the black Characters they have describ'd several of his Predecessors in, (to mention no more than his immediate Predecessor Pope *John* XII.) and how irregu-

lar,

lar, uncanonical, and unqualified they render them, nay, tho' Invaders, and ſometimes Murderers one of another, I do not ſee why *Leo* VIII. not quite ſo wicked as ſome of his Anteceſſors, ſhould be only called a Pſeudopope.

There is one Thing above the reſt very remarkable in the Life of Pope *John* XII. and which we have the Editors Word for, *viz.* This Pope was the firſt ſince St. *Peter* that chang'd his Name, which before was *Octavian*; but upon his Advancement to the Papacy, he aſſum'd that of *John*. A very pious Precedent truly, and worthy his Succeſſors' Imitation! Eſpecially if we conſider his infamous Death, to which it is high Time to bring the Miſcreant, and which we will take from the Author's own Words, *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 641. who quotes *Luitprand* for his Authority. " One Night, whilſt he " was ſolacing himſelf with another Man's Wife " in the Suburbs, he was in the very Inſtant of " Time ſmitten by the Devil, of which Wound " he in Eight Days Time dy'd." A Criminal worthy of ſuch an Executioner! But after all theſe horrid Crimes and Sins committed by Pope *John* XII. the Author ſays, " Tho' theſe Things " ſeem to be ſtrain'd to the utmoſt Degree by " *Luitprand*, yet I will not queſtion the Truth of " them; becauſe, bad as they are, they can give " no Damage or Scandal to the Catholick Faith; " for we all own, that St. *Peter* and his Succeſſors, " after they had received the Promiſe of Chriſt, " might err in Morals, but not in Faith." So that Pope *John*, tho' an adulterous Tyrant, *&c.* after he became St. *Peter*'s Succeſſor, (though he ſtole in like a Thief) could not err, but continued a good Catholick. But I would ask this charitable Author, Whether a Man that is guilty of Perjury, can or ought to be reckon'd in the Number of the Faith-

ful?

ful? (For this he hath said that Pope *John* had been, when he sware upon the Body of St. *Peter*, that he would never engage with *Berengarius* and *Adelbert* against the Emperor :) Or, Whether a Man that had solemnly, as in taking an Oath, called God to Witness, and had stipulated with his Maker for his Salvation upon the Condition of his Keeping or Breaking that Oath; I say, whether upon the Breach of such Oath, he is not guilty of the Breach of the Christian Faith? If we expect to be saved by the Gospel in our Conformity to it; undoubtedly we renounce the Covenant contained therein, upon the Breach of any Obligation we called God and his Gospel so solemnly to Witness.

To the other infamous Actions of Pope *John* XII. I shall add this one, and have done with him; *Luitprand*, *l.* 6. upon very good Authority, tells us, That this Pope ordain'd a Deacon in a Stable among his Horses. This *Baronius*, *ad An.* 963. endeavours all he can to invalidate; but *Luitprand* confirms it by Two Witnesses, *John* Bishop of *Narnium* in *Italy*; and *John* Cardinal Deacon; who did testify in a *Roman* Council, in the Presence of *Otho* the Emperor, *Se vidisse illum Diaconum ordinasse in Equorum Stabulo*: *That they themselves did see him, with their own Eyes, ordain a Deacon in a Stable of Horses.*

[964.] Pope *Benedict* V. is next in Course, but there is nothing more remarkable of him, than has already been said in the Life of Pope *John* XII. nor indeed of any else till *Gregory* V. except of *Boniface* VII. whom they call *Pseudopope*, who twice made his Way to the Papal Chair thro' Blood; first by the Murder of *Benedict* VI. *A. D.* 972. and next by the Death of *John* XIV. *A. D.* 984. whom he starv'd in Prison. This *John* XIV. was the second that chang'd his Name, in Imitation of his Predecessor

ceſſor *John* XII. (a precious Example to imitate!) for his true Name was *Peter*.

[996.] *Gregory* V. muſt follow the Faſhion, and inſtead of *Bruno*, which was his right Name; calls himſelf *Gregory* V. He, like too many of his Predeceſſors, cannot get Poſſeſſion of the Papal Chair without much Tumult and Miſchief. Being Nephew to the Emperor *Otho* III. or at leſt conſanguineouſly related to him, he eſpouſes his Cauſe againſt *John* XVI. whom *Creſcentius* Governor of *Rome* had ſet up in Oppoſition to *Gregory*. But when the Emperor approach'd *Rome* with his Army, *Creſcentius* flies, and leaves poor Pope *John* to the Fury of his Competitor; who, tho' a Churchman, could not ſhew the leaſt Charity to his Rival, but cauſes him to be treated in a moſt barbarous Manner, (as they tell it) for having his Hands and Ears cut off, and his Eyes put out, they ſet him upon an Aſs, forcing him to ride through the City in this mangled Condition, and all the Way he paſs'd to utter this Expreſſion: *Such Puniſhment hath he who dethrones the Pope of* Rome. *Lab: T. 9. p. 751.* This Story carries ſo much Horror in the Face of it, that if it be true, Nature muſt ſhrink at the Report of it: And beſides, if this ſententious Palinody of poor Pope *John* were to have been put in Execution, many of the *Roman* Pontiffs before and after this Time had found Employment for Aſſes and Executioners. But according to the Manner of the Author of this Pope *Gregory*'s Life's telling the Story, *Lab. ib.* there is ſo much of the Leaven of a *Popiſh Legend* in it, that I muſt beg the Editor's Pardon for not believing this Story. I will relate it in their own Words: "After this butcherly Mangling and Diſmembring "poor Pope *John*, *viz.* by cutting off his Hands "and Ears, and putting out his Eyes, they ſet him

"upon an Aſs, holding in his Hands (*which were* "*before cut off*) the Tail of another Aſs that went "before as his Guide, they drove him through the "City, *&c.*" This is ſo apparent a Blunder, that I cannot conceive how it could paſs the Editors; and ſo irreconcileable to Reaſon, that none but ſuch Biggots can believe. But I'll be ſo good natur'd for once, as to think they tell this idle Tale on Purpoſe to invalidate the Barbarity of the Fact.

The Pontificate of this *Gregory* V. is as remarkable for the foreſaid ridiculous Story, and a Forgery in the ſubſequent Part of this Pope's Life, as the Life of any Pope hitherto. Theſe two Fictions take up the greateſt Part of the Narrative; but the latter is ſo conſiderable, that nothing of greater Moment could be invented in Secular Affairs than it; and this grand Impoſture they uſher in with the uſual Solemnity and Formality of a Council. In the Year 996, there was a Council called at *Rome* by *Gregory* V. upon the Complaint of *Herluin* Biſhop of *Cambray* for ſeveral Injuries done to his Church, which were redreſs'd, and the Invaders of the Church excommunicated. This was the true and genuine Occaſion of this Council at *Rome*, *Baldric. Epiſcopi Noviomenſ. Chron. l.* 1. *c.* 3. and which the Editors in the Appendix, *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 1245. acknowledge in Part, allowing the Caſe of *Herluin*, and ſubjoining the Grant of Pope *Gregory* V. to it. But in the Title they unfairly ſtyle this, *An Addition to the* Roman *Council in the Year* 996, making this real Truth an Appendage to their Forgery, whereas it was the ſole Cauſe of the Council's Meeting. The Title of this Council, according to the Editors, *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 757. runs thus: *The Council of* Rome, *in which it was decreed, That for the Time to come the Emperor ſhould be choſen by Seven Electors, Princes of* Germany. *Held in the Year* 996. *In the Time*

ne of Gregory V. *Pope.* For Proof of this the itors can produce no other than *Baronius*'s single thority, which consists of Five Reasons: The l is, That in Affairs of great Moment the Fa- s and Bishops in Council were consulted. This rant, but deny the Consequence he draws from *viz.* That therefore the Electors derive their wer of Electing from *Gregory* V.

The Second Reason, to prove this Grant of ction from the Pope, is, That at this same Time re was a Synod at *Rome.* This I likewise grant, it was held upon another Occasion, as has already prov'd.

The Third Reason is, That the Bishop of *Rome* nted to *Otho the Great* the Liberty of choosing Successor, which other Emperors wanted. This rd to prove, for *Otho the Great* liv'd in the Be- ning of the Tenth Century, being Emperor he Year 937, and dy'd near 40 Years before ory V. was Pope. But to make this out a lit- etter, they tell us, there is a Decree of *Leo* VIII. nt, wherein it appears, that to induce *Otho* to ve the Church of *Rome* from the Tyranny it ur'd under, he promises him the Privilege of osing his Successor. What's this to the Purpose he Seven Electors? Or if it were, of what Au- ity could it be, since all the *Romish* Editors and orians call this *Leo* VIII. a Pseudopope, and al- him no Room in their Catalogue?

he Fourth Assertion, or Reason, is by Way of sion, and, in my Opinion, very improperly led; *viz.* That as the Empire was by the Au- ity of the Bishop of *Rome* translated from the to the *West*, so the Right of choosing the Em- r was granted to the *Germans* by the same Power. Allusion (tho' false in all its Parts) they pre- to support with a Citation out of Pope *Inno-*

cent III.'s Epiſtle to the Duke of *Duringen* in *Saxony*, which recognizes the foreſaid Grant. But this Epiſtle muſt be at leſt 200 Years after, and therefore of no Authority in this Caſe; beſides, it mentions unluckily the Emperor *Charlemain*, in whoſe Family the Imperial Diadem continued 100 Years, without the Aſſiſtance of the Biſhop of *Rome* to confirm or grant to them the Power of naming their Succeſſors.

The Fifth Reaſon is a very poſitive Aſſertion, more eaſily affirm'd than prov'd; which ſays, That the Power of chooſing the Emperor was granted to the Electors by none but Pope *Gregory* V. But the Authority which ſhould give this the Sanction is wanting, and which *Baronius* laments, ſaying, That if the Acts of this Council were but extant, it would be an eaſy Matter to prove what Sort of *Grant* this was that was given by the Pope to the Electors, whether in general to all the Princes of *Germany*, or only to Six or Seven particular Princes. But the Acts of this Council being loſt, how is it poſſible to know the Nature of this Grant? As for the Conjecture of *Baronius*, or any elſe, it is no Rule, eſpecially when the Conſequences they draw them from are taken from very falſe Principles. But as to this laſt Aſſertion, it is very improbable that *Otho* III. who had advanc'd *Gregory* to the Papal Chair, ſhould ſuffer him to ſubvert a Succeſſion by which he came to the Empire. It had been common to this very Time for Princes to make Popes, (of which this *Gregory* V. is the lateſt Inſtance) but not very uſual for Popes to make Kings or Emperors. Thus far I think it is plain that this *Roman* Council was called upon another Occaſion, *viz.* upon the Complaint of *Herluin* Biſhop of *Cambray*, and not in the Affair of the Electors of the Empire. But to ſet this Affair right, I dare affirm this

this to be the Truth of the Story: It was in this very Pope's Time, that the Manner of electing the Emperor was founded, and therefore the Editors lay their Scheme of it accordingly, and father it upon a Council, which, it is most certain, was called and held upon another Occasion. For near 200 Years after *Charlemain*, there was no certain or regular Way of Election; the Emperors in their Life-time nominating and recommending their Sons or Kinsmen to the *German* Princes: But about the End of the Tenth Century, the *Romans* began to insist upon their ancient Right of Election. This was like to kindle into a Flame on both Sides of the Hills, for the *Germans* were as obstinate as the *Italians*. But *Otho* III. a prudent Prince, found out an Expedient to prevent this Mischief, which was ready to burst into a Flame; for he procured a Cousin of his to be created Pope, by the Name of *Gregory* V. who being a *German* born, was easily induc'd to confirm the Choosing of the *Western Emperor* to the *German* Nation. This so highly disgusted some of the *Italian* Princes, that they deposed *Gregory*, and set up *John* in his Room; but the Emperor returns with an Army, displaces and severely handles his Enemies, and replaces his Cousin *Gregory* V. in *St. Peter's* Chair with Triumph. *Otho* being victoriously return'd to *Germany*, proposes to the Princes the Multiplicity of Inconveniencies and Incumbrances that attended the uncertain and unestablish'd Way of choosing an Emperor and his immediate Successor, and desir'd them to consider of a more regular Method. After many mature Deliberations and Opinions, they agreed upon a *Septemvirat*; *viz.* Seven Princes, who should be invested with a plenary Power to elect an Emperor and his next Successor. Hereupon a College of Electors was founded and constituted, all

to be within the Pale of the *German* Empire. Application being made to the Pope, he not only approv'd of this Business, but was ready to confirm it, provided that Three of the said Electors were Ecclesiasticks: Which was accordingly agreed to, and not by Way of Council, as the Editors vainly pretend; for *Otho* the Emperor had concerted this Thing before, but could not so easily bring the *Italians* to comply with him as when a Creature of his was at the Head of them, as his Cousin Pope *Gregory* V. was.

[999.] *Gerbert*, upon his Advancement to the Papacy, like some of his *Pious* Predecessors, changes his Name to that of *Silvester* II. He had not long embrac'd the Order of St. *Benedict*, but he is invited to Court, to take upon him the Charge and Education of *Hugh*, Son of *Robert* King of *France*; where he so cautiously behav'd himself, that he gain'd the Esteem of both those Princes: In the latter of which he had so intire an Interest and Influence, that a Council being called at *Rhemes*, *A. D.* 991. he procur'd *Arnulph*, the rightful Bishop to be deposed, and himself ordain'd in his Room.

For this, Pope *John* XV. excommunicates him, and the Bishops that were present at this Council, and in the Year 995, in another Council at *Rhemes*, he procures *Arnulph* to be restored, and *Gerbert* to be deposed; which so enrag'd him, that he by a high Hand, having obtained the Interest of the Emperor *Otho*, and the Favour of the People, is constituted Archbishop of *Ravenna*. Hitherto he continued a violent Opposer of, and an implacable Enemy to the Pontificate. The Author of this Pope's Life, *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 775. gives him a very indifferent Character in the former Part of his Life, calls the Council of *Rhemes*, which depos'd *Arnulph* and advanc'd *Gerbert*, a *Pseudosynod*; and

and adds, that being depoſed, he fled to the Emperor *Otho*. His flying in the Face of the Holy Apoſtolick See, which by *Fraud, Lies, &c. p. ibid. he had calumniated*, and the Injuries he had offer'd to *Arnulph*, were but indifferent Qualifications for a Candidate for the Papacy; therefore the Author thinks it neceſſary to wipe theſe Scandals off in Time, leſt they ſhould dry and grow indelible. *It's plain*, ſays he, *he did Pennance for theſe Crimes, becauſe he afterwards ſo behav'd himſelf, that the Emperor and People of* Ravenna *thought him worthy of that Archbiſhoprick, and that* Gregory V. *ſo highly approv'd of him, that he could deny him neither Ordination nor the Pall. ib.* But before we bring him to the Pontificate of *Rome*, it will be of Uſe as well as Satisfaction to the Reader, to know what theſe Affronts to the Holy See were; which nothing makes ſo plain as the Epiſtles of this *Gerbert*, and publiſh'd by the Editors, *Lab. ib. p* 743, 744, *&c.* before which there is alſo an Epiſtle of *Hugh* King of the *Franks* to Pope *John* XV. to the ſame Purpoſe, in which he juſtifies the Proceedings againſt *Arnulph*, queſtions his Holineſs's Sagacity much, by *deſiring him not to miſtake Things doubtful for certain, and* (tho' he had called the Council of *Rhemes*, which depoſed *Arnulph* and promoted *Gerbert*) *will not acknowledge himſelf to have acted any Thing againſt the Apoſtolick See. ibid.*

The Second Epiſtle is that of *Gerbert* to *Conſtantine* the Abbot; wherein he cautions him againſt the Encroachments of the Pope's Legat, bids him look to himſelf, for, *When his Neighbour's Houſe is on Fire, he is not out of Danger.* Tells him, *The Conſequence is plain, for not only the Dignity and Veneration of the Holy Prieſthood was in Danger; but the State of the Kingdom.* Denies the Supremacy, ſaying, *That without the Conſent of the Biſhops, (ſc.* in Council) *he*

neither could nor ought to deprive a Bishop, tho' a wicked Man. ibid. p 744. alledging at the End, by Way of Maxim, in Opposition both to the Infallibility and Supremacy, *That Matter of Fact ought not to depend upon the Indulgence of the Judges, but upon Truth. ibid.*

The Third Epistle is from the same *Gerbert* to *Siguinus* Archbishop of *Sens*, whom he endeavours to prejudice all he can against the Sentence of the Court of *Rome*. The whole Epistle being one continued Series of Invectives against the Infallibility and Supremacy, we will excerp the most remarkable. It begins thus: " Your Prudence ought " to beware the Subtilties of crafty Men, and to " hearken to the Voice of the Lord. *If they say* " *unto you, Behold here is Christ, or there is Christ, do* " *not believe them. Mat.* 24. 23. At *Rome*, they say, " there is one that can justify what you condemn, " and condemn what you justify. *But it is God that* " *justifieth.* How then can our Adversaries in the de- " posing *Arnulph* say, We ought to wait for the " Determination of the Bishop of *Rome*? Will " they make us believe, that the Judgment of the " Bishop of *Rome* is greater than that of God? " But the First Bishop of *Rome*, and Prince of the " Apostles, cry'd, *Acts* 5, 29. *we ought rather to obey* " *God than Men.* And the great Apostle, *Galat.* 1. 8. " says, *If any one shall preach unto you other than what* " *we have preach'd, tho' an Angel from Heaven, let him* " *be accurs'd.*" Here it is to be observ'd, that the Editors in the Margin insert these Words, Gerbert *forgets those Words of the Lord,* " *Whatsoever* " *they shall say unto you, observe and do; but do not as* " *they do.*" But whether *Gerbert* had this Text in his Head or not, he goes on, and falls not a little foul on the Infallibility. " What, says he, tho' " Pope *Marcellinus* sacrific'd to *Jupiter*, must there- " fore all other Bishops sacrifice? I positively affirm,

" That

" That if the Bishop of *Rome* shall offend against " a Brother, and being often admonish'd, will not " hear the Church, I say, this very Bishop of " *Rome*, according to the Word of God, ought to " be regarded no more than a Heathen or a Pub- " lican. For the higher his Station is, the greater " his Fall." The rest of this Epistle is made up of Citations out of several Popes, which are urg'd in Contradiction to the Practice of the Bishop of *Rome* at that Time. *ib. p.* 745.

Upon the Death of *Gregory* V. a Kinsman of the Emperor *Otho*, *Gerbert*, another Cousin of the Emperor, is chosen Pope, who, as has been said, chang'd his Name to that of *Sylvester* II. The Author of this Pope's Life, in endeavouring to conceal the Manner of his being chosen, lays open the whole Cheat, and plainly proves this Pope, as well as his Predecessor, to be chosen by the Emperor's Means. *He was promoted to the Pontificate*, says he, *by the Patronage and Interest of the Emperor* Otho III. *Tho'* Aimoinus, l. 5. c. 45. *writes, That he was chosen by the People, who, without Doubt, were very willing to oblige the Emperor. But*, continues he, *I believe the Emperor did countenance him, because he was his Kinsman.* I am very much of the Author's Opinion in this Part of the Story, but can't agree with him in that idle Tale he pretends to take from *Ditmar*, which would make us believe, that *Gerbert*, before he was Pope, had endar'd himself to the Emperor by an admirable Piece of Clockwork. It's certain so politick a Prince as *Otho* made Popes for other Ends than their Skill in Mechanism, and whose Abilities were not to be circumscrib'd within the Bounds of regular Motion, like that of Clocks, but must occasionally answer all Ends. It is agreed on, by all that mention this Pope, that he had a polite and ingenuous Edu-

Education, being eminent for his great Knowledge in Philosophy and Astrology. But whether this, or any other Reason, gave Occasion to Cardinal *Benno* to stigmatize Pope *Silvester* II. with the Study of Magick, and that he pawn'd his Soul to the Devil to obtain the Papacy, I shall not determine, but leave the Reader to judge from the Editors partial and unreasonable Inferences. An ill Name with them is half Conviction; for which Reason no Author must be allow'd to speak the Truth, (tho' ever so palpable) that hath once written against them. And therefore *Baronius*, and all the Favourers of the Pontificate, cast all the vile Reproaches and Calumny imaginable on *Benno*. The Author of this Pope's Life, *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 775. says, That *Benno* called himself *Cardinal-Archpresbyter*; but, whatever that Author may say, it's certain, *Benno* was created *Cardinal-Archpresbyter* by *Clement* III. formerly called *Guibert*, whom, tho' they call Antipope, as being put in by the Emperor *Henry* IV. yet considering their former Manner of electing and creating Popes, either by the Emperor, or bribing the People, (as has been often hinted) I cannot see that any Pope for many Years came in upon a juster Foot than *Clement* III. and for this we have the Editors own Words. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 4, 5. " *Henry* IV. not complying in all Things " with the Pope, (*sc. Gregory* VII.) is, with several " Bishops excommunicated by him; and tho' they " were seemingly reconcil'd, yet the Breach soon " became wider than ever, for *Rodolph* of *Sweden* " is invited in by the Princes of *Germany*, (*without* " Gregory's *Knowledge*, *say they*) and chosen King; " but the Emperor *Henry* subduing *Rodolph*, be- " gan to despise the Pope more than before. Up- " on which he, in a Synod at *Rome*, *A. D.* 1080, " excommunicates and deposes *Henry*, and trans-

" fers

" fers the Crown to *Rodolph*, on this Condition, " That hereafter no Lay-Persons should claim or " confer the Investiture of Ecclesiastick Benefices. " *Henry* hearing this, calls a Council at *Brescia* in " *Italy*, wherein *Gregory* is deposed, and *Guibert* " chosen in his Room. And pursuing this Resolu- " tion, he takes the City of *Rome*, and creates " *Guibert* Pope by the Name of *Clement* III." So that considering Circumstances, the Emperor had Reason of his Side; for if Rebellion be a Crime, this Pope was highly guilty, notwithstanding his Infallibility, and deserv'd to be depriv'd of Life as much as of the Pontificate. But their Way of Stifling a Story is very pleasant; for, after some general Reflections on *Benno*, they tell us, *Labb. T. 9. p. 776. It is Refutation enough of a Story to know the Author.* A poor Way of Answering! But of this Story, the Reader may see more in the Life of *Hildebrand*, written by *Benno*.

Till *Silvester* was by the Favour of the Emperor made Pope, he was the most violent Champion of his Time against the Papacy; but, like several of his Predecessors, the Advantages of Supremacy and Infallibility soon inform'd his Judgment. There are Three Epistles which bear his Name as Pope, the Second of which, to *Arnulph*, according to *Cossart*'s Note, cannot be *Silvester*'s, *Lab. T. 9. p. 778.* but *Gregory*'s, and that the Mistake crept in through the Ignorance or Carelesness of the Librarian. *For*, says *Cossart*, *is it likely that* Silvester *should so judicially restore* Arnulph *to his Archbishoprick, whom he had for Crimes before depos'd, and which Sentence he left attested by such publick Monuments?* Besides, there are some Passages which contradict its being *Silvester*'s, one of which is, *ut quia tua Abdicatio Romano Assensu caruit, Romanæ Pietatis Munere credatis posse reparari.* It's very improbable that *Silvester*, who was the Oc-

Occasion of *Arnulph's* Deposition, (which was done without the Consent of the Bishop of *Rome*) should pretend to make Reparation as Bishop of *Rome*, when what he had acted in the Case of *Arnulph* was done and maintain'd in Contempt of the Bishop of *Rome*. But there is greater Reason to suspect the Truth of the First and Second Epistles of this Pope than what we have yet urg'd. *The First*, says *Binius* in his Note on it, *was written by* Gerbert *before he was Pope, and found in the Library of* Papirius Massan *after his Death, which I have here inserted to preserve from Perishing*. Were this ever so certain a Truth, it could not take off the just Ground of Suspicion contained in the Epistle it self. First, the Editors cannot agree about the Name of the Person to whom it is written, the Title calling him *Azolin*, the Margin correcting it, and calling him *Ascelin*: But we'll wave that. Secondly, in the Epistle, he reproaching this *Azolin* with several Faults, says, *That being invited by the Archbishops of* Turen *and* Rhemes *to the Synod of* Compeigne, *he acknowledges his Offence, and begs Pardon*, &c. This is a most undeniable Proof of its Falshood, for it is most certain, that no Council was held at *Compeigne* from the Year 833, till the Year 1085.

The Second Epistle is pretended to be recover'd by *Sirmondus*, and by him transcrib'd out of the Book of *S. Remigius*, Archbishop of *Rhemes*. This *Labbé*, *T.* 9. *p.* 778. says in the Margin, and that it was never publish'd before. Indeed I believe him. Nor can I conceive how this Epistle should be in *S. Remigius* of *Rhemes's* Book, who is allow'd to have dy'd *A. D.* 545. I will not charge *Sirmondus* with such an Error, but rather measure this Epistle by the Title, and the subject Matter; both which give the Bishop of *Rome* sole Power of restoring

ſtoring a depoſed Biſhop to his See. It is ſo particular in the Form of it, that it looks more like a primary Inſtitution or Ordination of a Biſhop than a Reſtoration, in which there was not that Occaſion of mentioning ſo many Particulars; *viz.* the Staff and Ring, the Uſe of the Pall, Privileges, Monaſteries, *&c.* all which of Courſe return'd to the reſtor'd Biſhop. But *Coſſart*, in the Note aforeſaid, plainly ſhews the Neceſſity of this Epiſtle, which was to ſhew the Nullity of the Fact in *Arnulph*'s Depoſition; *For*, ſays he, *the Pope was oblig'd to take off the Condemnation, (ſc.* of *Arnulph) not becauſe it was injuſt in it ſelf, but becauſe it wanted the* Roman *Sanction. ib. p.* 778. So that, tho' this Sentence had been injuſt, if it had received its Sanction from *Rome* it had been valid. But the true Reaſon is, The Council of *Rhemes*, *A. D.* 991. in which *Arnulph* was depoſed, being called by the King, and inſiſted on by him, as has been ſaid, there was a Neceſſity of trumping up ſome Sham-Authority to maintain that Power which ſince has been claim'd by the *Roman* See, *viz.* that no Council ſhould be allow'd of that was not called or confirm'd by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and that no Biſhop could be reſtored without his Authority.

[1000.] We are now come to the Eleventh Century, which was remarkable for the great Encroachments made by the Court of *Rome*, both on Church and State. About the Beginning of it the *Sacramental Controverſy* grew warm, at the Inſtigation of *Leutheric* Archbiſhop of *Sens*, which was afterwards carried on by *Berengarius* Archdeacon of *Angiers*. In this Century likewiſe the Emperor *Henry* IV. and Pope *Gregory* VII. quarrel'd about Inveſtitures and other Rights of the Regale, which Pope *Gregory*, partly by Force, and partly by Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures, extorted from the Emperor; who

by

by thus quitting his Ground, soon gave Way to greater Encroachments; for the Pope having carried his Point in the former, insists on the Right of Supremacy in the Apostolick See over all, even Kings themselves, advancing by these Means the Prerogative of the Papal Chair above the Imperial. Hereupon *Henry* IV. is excommunicated in a *Roman* Synod, and soon after deposed, and *Rodolph* of *Sweden* put in his Room. In this Century likewise a hot Dispute arose between the Patriarchs of *Rome* and *Constantinople* about the Right of Supremacy. In the Middle of it, the Institution of Cardinals was enlarged, who being formerly only as Clergy fix'd and intituled to particular Churches, were about this Time establish'd into an Apostolick College, made Counsellors to the Pope, Judges, Senators, *&c.* But of these in their proper Course of Time.

There is very little said of the Pontificate of *John* XVII. and XVIII. by the Editors; nor is there much more said of

[1009.] *Sergius* IV. Only this is remarkable in the short Account they give of this Pope's Life; *viz.* " That whereas he was called *Peter* before he " was created Pope, out of Respect to the Apo- " stolick Dignity, he chang'd his Name to that of " *Sergius*, as appears by the Sepulchral Inscription " in the *Lateran*:

——— *Mutato permansit Nomine Præsul*
Sergius ex Petro. ———

Labb. T. 9. *p.* 892, 893.

But with this Author's Leave, if there were any Weight in Names, I should look upon the Name of *Peter* to be much more Apostolical and venerable than that of *Sergius*. And altho' he takes Oe-

casion to quarrel with *Ditmar*, for asserting, that this Pope took on him the Name of *Sergius*, because he did not like his own, which was *Buccaporci*, or *Swine's-cheek*; yet, *ibid. p.* 802. he makes Use of the same *Ditmar*'s Authority to confirm the Story of a Shower of Oil, which fell in a certain Church at *Rome*, a Vessel of which was sent to the Emperor *Henry*.

[1012.] *Benedict* VIII. succeeds *Sergius*, who is no sooner created Pope, but by *Gregory* his Antipope, and the *Romans*, he is expell'd the City; whereupon he flies to the Emperor, then in *Saxony*, who repairing to *Rome* with an Army, routs *Gregory* and restores *Benedict*.

In the Year 1021, there was a Council called at *Salingstede* near *Francfort* in *Germany*, in the Case of Morals and Ecclesiastick Discipline. This Council has the usual Varnish in the Title, *viz.* In the Time of Pope *Benedict* VIII. and the Emperor *Henry*. But the Preface is more plain, and says it was called by *Aribo* Archbishop of *Mentz* and other Bishops, 11 *Id. Aug.* in the 20th Year of *Henry* as King, and 6th as Emperor. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 844. the Pope being not named in the Preface, nor in the Council, but with an Exception; as we shall see.

Upon a Complaint in this Council, that some weak Presbyters had superstitiously used to cast the *Corporale* or Linnen-Altar-Cloth into Fires to extinguish them; this Council, upon Pain of Anathematization, forbad it. This was a superstitious Custom that had in several Places prevail'd, which the Fathers in this Council wisely condemn'd in the Sixth Canon of it.

The 18th Canon of this Council treads hard upon the late assum'd Prerogative of the Infallibility of the Pontificate. To make this more plain, take the Words of the Canon from the Editors:

 "Where-

"Whereas many are so foolishly perswaded, that "in any capital Crime they will not receive any "Pennance from their own Priests, believing, that "if they go to *Rome*, the Apostolick Father can "remit all their Sins; it seems good to this Holy "Council, that such Indulgence is of no Advan-"tage to them; but rather let them perform the "Pennance enjoined them by their proper Priests, "and then, if they will go to *Rome*, let them ask "Leave of their proper Bishop, and take Letters "from them to the Apostolick Father." Here is a plain Renunciation of the Papal Infallibility; and whilst this Cannon reprehends the People for a wrong Application, in going to *Rome* only for Pennance, it charges the Bishop of *Rome* with Irregularity, who by this Action encroaches upon the Liberty and Prerogative of other Churches, which the Canons and Councils of all Ages hitherto forbad any to invade, but to be content within their own Limits.

The 19th Canon forbids any Incroachment likewise in the Penitent, "obliging him during "the Performance of his *Carrine*, or 40 *Days Fast*, "not to ramble from Place to Place, but to stay "in the Place where he received his Pennance, "that his proper Priest may be his Witness: But "in Case of Necessity by hostile Injuries he can-"not perform his Pennance, his own Priest may "recommend him to some other Brother, where "he may quietly perform his Fast." This Cannon likewise gives the same Check to the Encroachments of *Rome* as the former, not allowing the Penitent to go to *Rome* in Case of Necessity, but to perform his Pennance where his own Priest shall recommend or direct.

The Council of *Mentz* was call'd the Year following by the same *Aribo* Archbishop thereof. This *Surius*, in the Life of S. *Gothard*, *cap.* 22. calls a General Council, in these Words: "*Aribo* Archbishop of *Mentz* invited the Emperor that Year to keep his Pentecost there, where he likewise called a General Council, *&c.*" These Words are very Nonsense in themselves; for *Aribo* being but Archbishop of *Mentz*, could only call a Provincial Council; and therefore do much wonder at the great Oversight of *Labbé*, *T.* 9. *p.* 854. that he should let this pass without some Colour or Exception, since in *T.* 2. *p.* 3, *&* 65. he says, there cannot be a General Council except the Pope preside in it by himself or his Legates. But it is most evident, that Pope *Benedict* presided in this Council neither by himself nor his Legates, nor did he so much as call this Council, which themselves own.

[1024.] *John* XIX. enters the Pontificate very scandalously, according to the Account the Editors give of him; "invading the Apostolick See (say they) with the Power of Princes and a vast Largess of Money. But by the singular Providence of God, being admonished by Letters from *William* Abbot of the Monastery of S. *Benign*, he understood that he held the Pontificate unjustly; therefore doing Pennance, he abdicated himself, and then was chosen anew." *Labb.* *T.* 9. *p.* 855. Here is a fine Turn to preserve Succession and Infallibility! There is not a Century to this very Time, since the Church of Christ was form'd into Discipline, but in repeated Canons condemns this wicked Practice of acquiring Benefices by Gifts, many of them depriving the Transgressor of both Episcopal and Sacerdotal Office for ever: Nor can this wretched Evasion wipe off

the Infamy; for when this Pope had once renounc'd, or abdicated, as they call it, he ought to have forborn ever profaning the holy Purple by his vile Approaches to it. When God permits such lewd Abominations to be practis'd, it looks as if his Providence (which they in this Case profanely boast of) had forsaken St. *Peter*'s Chair, and had given the Possession of it up to their own wild Imaginations.

To the End of this Pope's Life the Editors subjoin an Epistle of the foresaid *William* Abbot of St. *Benign* of *Dijon* to Pope *John* upon this Occasion: William *having heard, that the Title of* Universal *was granted by Pope* John *to the Church of* Constantinople, *he chides him for it.* This is the Title of the Epistle, *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 855. And truly, whoever the Author is, he deals very plainly with his Holiness upon the Matter, and endeavours to set his Infallibility right. "There is a Report (says "he) at which he that hears it cannot but be "scandaliz'd: For since the Power of the *Roman* "Empire, which formerly flourished in a Monar-"chial State, is now managed by many Scepters, "the Power of binding and loosing in Heaven "and Earth is devolved on the Magisterial Power "of St. *Peter*." This is a special Derivation of Power, and as wisely applied! But as if his Infallibility wanted Instruction, he goes on: "And "for the future we desire you would act as be-"comes the Universal Bishop in the Discipline of "the Holy and Apostolick See." *Ibid.* The Editors, in the Life of this Pope, and in the Epistle, agree exactly in their Account of the Affair of the Church of *Constantinople*, desiring to be entitled *Universal*, both citing *Glaber*, *L.* 4. *c.* 1. But *Cossart* will not let it pass without a little more Plausibility, lest People should think that Pope *John* had made

made a false Step, and granted the *Greek* Church their Request; for (say they) in this Pope's Life, "the *Greeks* sent their Legates on this Errand well "loaded with Presents:" A Charm the Bishops of *Rome* in those Days could not resist. And therefore *Cossart* says, "That this was only a false Re-"port: Not but that Pope *John* did labour to "bring the Matter about, but was deterr'd by the "Letters of the Gallican Bishops, and especially "of this Abbot *William*." It is not worth while to trifle away any more Time about this Story, only to shew the Disingenuity of the Editors: For in the first Place, the Story it self is much to be question'd. Nor is it reasonable for any Man to believe that People would court and sue for what they had many Years before been invested with by a more lawfull Authority: For the Second General Council of *Constantinople* gives this Church the First Post of Honour after that of *Rome*; as appears in *Can.* III. And the Fourth General Council at *Chalcedon* speaks plainer, *Can.* V. and says, "The "Bishop of *New Rome* (meaning *Constantinople*) "shall enjoy the same Honours with that of Old "*Rome*, upon Account of the Translation of the Empire." This Canon and the Two following are left out of the Collection of *Joannes Antiochenus*, and the Latin Version of *Dionysius Exiguus*. They are likewise left out by *Peter Crab* and *Longus à Coriolano*; and *Cabbasutius* argues very furiously against their Validity; for it is plain from this Canon, that the See of *Constantinople* paid no Submission to that of *Rome*, nor any Respect by Way of Superiority: For, as Bishop *Beveridge* has most learnedly observed in his Annotation on this Canon, the Reason of the Fathers giving this Honour to the See of *Rome*, was not because it was the Seat of St. *Peter*, or because the Bishop of

Rome is Christ's Vicar, but because it was the Imperial City, or Seat of the Empire. The Words of the Canon plainly make this to be the Sense of the Fathers, *propter Imperii Translationem*; *by Reason of the Translation of the Empire*; assigning that and no other as the Reason.

Secondly, *Cossart* in his Note on this Epistle gives a very odd Reason for the Writing of it. "From "the false Report (says he) *William* took the Oc-"casion of Writing." In so solemn a Case as this seem'd to be, if true, and in such distant Circumstances as those between a Patriarch and an Abbot, a Man may reasonably be thought to take his Cause of Writing from a better Hand than that of common Fame, which is too often a common Lyar.

Thirdly, *Baronius* may be said to give this Story as mortal a Blow as any Thing else, though he does it a sideway: For speaking of *Glaber*, who hands this Epistle to the Editors, he says; "Tho' "he was careful in reviewing his History, yet he "was guilty of many Errors, (in Judgment, I "suppose he means) for he will not allow the "*Roman* Pontiff any more Power in another's "Diocese than other Bishops, who are circum-"scrib'd within their proper Bounds, beyond "which they cannot act." For my Part, I cannot conceive what End this Epistle answers, except that of recognizing the pretended Universality of *Rome*; though by admitting the Increpations of Abbot *William*, it shocks the Infallibility.

The Editors, *Lab. T. 9. p.* 861. foists in a Council, which does not deserve the Name; which they pretend to take from the *Hildesheim* Chronicle. But that which is most to be wonder'd at, is, they let this Author pass without a Note, or any Chastisement. This Council is by the foresaid Chronicle

nicle call'd, *The General Synod of* Palithi, *in which the Emperor presided.* This is quite wrong, according to the Position they have so often laid down, *viz.* That there can be no General Council without the Pope's Calling and Presiding in, either by himself or his Legates.

[1033.] Pope *Benedict* IX. is obtruded on the Apostolick Chair by Force, as his Predecessor was, which he most scandalously possess'd for Eleven Years. This the Author of this Pope's Life defends; and though he owns him thrust in by the Power of his Father, Count *Albert*, and charges him with Want of Morals and Age, (being but 18 Years old) yet all these cannot make him irregular, but that he was St. *Peter*'s Successor, being acknowledged by all the World for *Roman* Pontiff. But the Reason of making use of this for an Argument they plainly tell in the following Instance: Among all that acknowledged *Benedict* IX. for Bishop of *Rome*, this Author introduces *Herman* Archbishop of *Hamburgh*, and *Alebrand* and *Adelbert* his Successors, who took their Palls from *Rome*. But let us take more of this Pope's Character from the foresaid Author, *(Lab. T. 9. p 936, 937.)* "Pope "*Benedict* (says he) being given up to Luxury "and Pleasures, ran headlong into all Vice, gi- "ving great Scandal to the Faithful by his wicked "Life: But at last, either by the Means of *Ptole-* "*my*, the most potent Consul, or the Perswasion of "one *Bartholomew* Abbot of the *Crypta Ferrata*, he "quitted the Pontificate. Into his Place gets *Sil-* "*vester* III. by Bribery and such wicked Practices, "dividing the *Roman* Church by a new Schism. "But after Three Months, *Benedict* deposes this "Intruder, who himself is thrust out by *John* the "Archpriest of *Rome*." Here was a Schismatical Interruption with a Vengeance, and might not (as

the Author says) be improperly compar'd to the Three-headed Monster come from Hell to infest St. *Peter's* Chair. But see the wretched Contrivance of this Author to heal this Schism! "A "certain Presbyter of the *Roman* Church, call'd "*Gratian* (afterwards *Gregory* VI.) pitying this sad "State of the Church, goes to every one of the "Pretenders, (not to buy any Spiritual Dignity, "no not he! but to recover the Peace of the "Church) and with the old Argument, Gold, "persuades them to quit the Holy See. Thus *Be-* "*nedict*, for his Part, having the Revenues of *Eng-* "*land* assigned him, (no small Portion in those "Days) resigns, having by Force and Tyranny "for Eleven Years usurped the Papacy. After his "Example, the rest, being content with each his "assigned Portion, renounce, and the Church is "restor'd to her former Union and Concord." Thus giving Money with them is no Bribery, and Bribery no Simony. Therefore they take all Care possible in this Pope's Life and in the next to tell us, that *Gratian* did it not to purchase any Spiritual Dignity, but to procure the Peace of the Church! Very good! But consider, that without Money this Peace could not have been procured; nor could that have been done but by such a Man as had Power to raise Sums, and set apart the Revenues of the Church for those that resign'd. These Things argue great Power in one Man; and it is not to be question'd but he that did them could as easily the same Way make himself Pope, as change his Name from *Gratian* to that of *Gregory* VI. of whom, more hereafter.

The *Berengarian* Heresy (as the *Romanists* call it) beginning in this Pope's Time, we will take Notice of it here, though it continued disputable in the Reigns of 13 or 14 several succeeding Popes.

Cabba-

Cabbasutius, p. 392. is very clamourous, introducing this Story with his usual Prologue of foul Language, calling *Berengarius* Monster, Arch-heretick, Viper, *&c.* His Partiality is sufficient (besides his Unmannerliness) to prejudice any against his Account of this Feud, and therefore I shall take little Notice of him.

Leutheric Archbishop of *Sens* (as has been said) was the Beginner of the Sacramental Controversy, which *Berengarius* Archdeacon of *Angiers* in a few Years after takes up, and makes his own, for in the Year 1035. he openly denies the CARNAL PRESENCE of Christ to be in the Eucharist; affirming the Body and Blood of our Lord to be present some Sacramental Way only, or figuratively, drawing *Bruno* Archbishop of *Angiers* to his Side. This had been the Opinion of *Bertram*, or *Ratbram* in the Ninth Century, who positively denied the Transubstantiation of the Eucharist, affirming the Presence of Christ to be only metaphorically in it. His Treatise *de Corpore & Sanguine Domini* makes this plain, and therefore the Champions of the Pontificate endeavour to eclipse the Reputation of the Author, some calling him Heretick and Novelist, others saying that the Work is corrupt and adulterate, *&c.* As to the first, the Morals of the Man, from their own Authors, and his unspotted Fame, are a sufficient Vindication, his very Enemies allowing him to be a modest, pious, and learned Man. And as to the genuine Authority of the Work, besides many old Books, the Paschal Homily of our *Ælfric*, who liv'd in the Tenth Century, is taken almost *verbatim* out of this *Bertram*'s Book. To wave the Authority of *John Scotus* and others, the ingenuous Confession of *Mabillonius* is a sufficient Conviction, who affirms, That an ancient Manuscript-Book 800 Years old,

in the Monastery of *Lobiens*, mentions *Bertram*'s Name in the Beginning and End. *Sæc. Bened.* 4. *par.* 2. *præfat. n.* 81. *Anthony Sanders* likewise mentions the same Manuscript, *Biblioth. Belg.* MSS. *Part* 1. *p.* 303. and yet *Bellarmin*, *Genebrard*, *Possevin*, *Gregory de Valentia*, and others, would make the World believe, that this very *Bertram* or *Ratbram*, in his Book *de Corp. & Sang. Domini*, favours the Opinion of the Church of *Rome* about the Eucharist, though at the same Time it differs from it as much as the East does from the West. *Berengarius* affirms this to have been the Opinion not only of *Bertram* and *Scotus*, but of the Primitive Church, *viz.* That the Bread and Wine were not essentially, but figuratively chang'd into the Lord's Body and Blood. Upon this, *Berengarius* is vigorously attacked by the Asserters of the *Carnal Presence*: Notwithstanding which he persists in his Opinion, defending it both with his Tongue and Pen; till Pope *Leo* IX. in the Year 1050. calling a Synod at *Rome*, upon the Reading *Berengarius*'s Epistle to *Lanfranc*, (afterwards Archbishop of *Canterbury*) he is condemned of Heresy, and depriv'd of the Communion of the Church; which was likewise done the same Year in a Council at *Vercell*, in which *Berengarius* appeared by his Two Proctors. About that Time a Convention was held in *Normandy*, in the Presence of *William the Bastard*, Duke thereof, where *Berengarius* being likewise present, his Opinion is argued, but is over-ruled. At *Paris*, though absent, he is condemned by King *Henry*; and in the Year 1055. he is proceeded against in the same Manner at *Florence*. The same Year Pope *Victor* sends his Legat *Hildebrand* (afterwards Pope *Gregory* VII.) into *Gaul*, who, calling a Council at *Tours*, makes *Berengarius* recant. But 1059, in a Synod at *Rome*, being allowed to make his Defence,

he

he so well behav'd himself, according to *Leo Hostiensis Chron. Cassinens. l. 3. c. 33.* that no Body could answer him. At last *Alberic* Deacon of *Cassinum*, a most learned Man, is call'd to the Synod, who, after much Argument, and neither yielding, desired a Week's Truce, in which Time he wrote a Book against *Berengarius*, who being wearied out with ill Treatment, and terrified with Threats, renounces his Opinion in Form. Several Synods to the Year 1078, condemned *Berengarius* and his Adherents; and then, on the Feast of *All-Saints*, Pope *Gregory* VII. summons a Council, in which *Berengarius* draws up a short Confession of his Faith; and being desirous to protract Time as long as he could, he obtained Leave till the next Synod, which was in the Year 1079. in which they propos'd a new Confession to him, which he subscrib'd, renouncing and abjuring his former Opinion. That this was an Act of Force, appears plainly from the Consequence; for it is most certain from *Lanfranc*, and others his Cotemporaries, that he returned to his First Opinion. But that which puts it beyond Dispute is a Manuscript Treatise of *Berengarius*, which *Mabillonius* owns he had read, in which he utterly rescinds the Third Confession, confuting it by many Arguments; and adding, that he took it through Fear of Death. *After this* (says the same *Mabillonius*) *he return'd to his Senses, and to the last stuck to the Catholick Faith*; but does not prove it by one Instance or Argument. Thus *Cabbasutius* goes on to the End of his Story with great Prejudice, asserting more than he proves, to the last continuing his foul Language, for which he would certainly have corrected himself, had he but look'd into the Author he mentions, *viz. William* of *Malmsbury*, who would have taught him more Manners than to have cast such vile, dirty

Epithets

Epithets on a Man, whom his Enemies acknowledged to have been famous for Holineſs of Life and good Literature; and undoubtedly *William* of *Malmsbury* (who lived within 100 Years of him) would never have beſtowed ſuch Encomiums on him for his Humility, Charity, Modeſty, Chaſtity, Zeal, Abſtinence, *&c.* if he had not deſerved them: Nor had *Hildebert* Biſhop of *Cenoma* given ſo advantageous a Character, nor ſo highly recommended him to Poſterity in his Epitaph, if he had not deſerved thoſe Eulogies; which may be ſeen at large in *Malmſ. de geſtis Reg. l.* 3. *fol.* 63. *Hildebert* lived in the ſame Time with *Berengarius*, and therefore may be allowed to know him better than *Cabbaſutius*, and other modern Authors, who have taken that rude Freedom with him. And ſince *Cabbaſutius* takes the Liberty of mentioning Two ſuch Authors as *William* of *Malmsbury* and *Hildebert*, he ought either to have forborn his own Scurrility, or told the Reader what theſe Two Authors had ſaid in Praiſe of *Berengarius*; but his not telling what they ſay, makes them look like Corroborators of what he ſays. The true Ground of this ſeems to be taken by *Cabbaſutius* from *Baronius*, *ad An.* 1088; whoſe Prejudice to *Hildebert* proceeds from his applauding *Berengarius*, which no *Roman* Paraſite can allow; and whatſoever *Baronius* lays down, the reſt ſeldom fail to follow. Thus under the Pretence of Hereſy, they ſuppreſs Orthodox Truths, and eſtabliſh Hereſy in the Church by Law.

[1044.] *Gregory* VI. whoſe true Name was *Gratian*, for his great Service in procuring Peace to the Church by Bribery, and the Papacy to himſelf by Simony, is by the Editors ſtil'd, *The Deliverer of the Church*; and the Fact is by them call'd *moſt prudent*, *which*, they ſay, *none but that moſt lying Schiſmatick*, *Cardinal* Benno, *ever queſtion'd.* Lab. T. 9. p 942.

p. 942. But if they please to reflect, I think they need no greater Enemies than themselves, *ibid.* p. 943. " for after Pope *Gregory* VI. was fixed in " the Papacy, he banish'd Sacrilegious Invaders " of holy Things, and other wicked Persons, and " whom he could not by Words and Spiritual " Censures, he restrain'd by the Spiritual Sword: " For which Cause (say they) he incurr'd the " Hatred and Ill-will of the *Romans*, who at that " Time liv'd in Rapine and Theft, and who ac- " cused him of Simony and Murder to King *Hen-* " *ry*, then at *Placentia*. Therefore calling a Coun- " cil at *Sutri*, in which he presided, being con- " victed by no Proof, nor judged by any Sentence, " for the Peace of the Church, and to prevent a " Schism, which then threaten'd it, in Imitation of " *Gregory Nazianzen*, he quietly resign'd, after he had " sate Two Years and Eight Months." A very plausible Story truly to those that know nothing of the Matter! Let us take it to Pieces, and the Truth will more plainly appear. As to his banishing Sacrilegious Persons, it is very probable, for Two of a Trade seldom agree; and considering Circumstances before and afterwards, I do not see how he can wash his Hands clean from that dreadful Sin. As to his using the Military Sword in suppressing Offenders, it was uncanonical in him; but yet a Prognostick of a future Usurpation in the Possessors of St. *Peter*'s Chair, which too soon fell out. They charge him with Simony and Murder; but do not bring him off so cleverly as they bring him on; " for, they say, being accused " of Simony and Murder, he went to King *Henry*, " then at *Placentia*;" and so leave him. But immediately they tell us, he call'd a Council, in which he presided, *&c.* This is the old inconsistent, incoherent Story of Pope *Marcellinus*'s trying

ing and judging himself, (*vid. ad An.* 296.) Surely *Gregory*, who laboured so much to obtain the Papacy, would not have quitted it without Compulsion, if he had not seen a Storm approaching, which he could not avoid. *Hermannus* the *Cripple*, a Writer in this Age, and whom the Editors cite, *ibid.* 943, 944. sets the whole Matter in a true Light. "Coming to *Placentia*, (says he, speaking "of King *Henry*) he very honourably received "*Gregory* VI. whom the *Romans* had made Pope. "All Things succeeding happily, about *Christmas* "a Synod was held at *Sutrium* near *Rome*, and the "Case of erroneous Popes being strictly examin'd, "he depriv'd *Gratian*, the Pope convict, of his "Pastoral Staff. Then, by the Consent of all, as "well *Romans* as others, he chose *Suidger* (much "against his Will) chief Bishop of the *Roman* "Church." These are *Hermannus*'s Words, and which carry a quite different Meaning with them than what the Editors intend, if we consider their subsequent Argument. In the first Place, they seem industriously to conceal the Name of the King in this Citation of *Hermannus*, though it is plain from the Context whom he means; for it is certain that *Gregory* VI. fled to King *Henry* at *Placentia*, where he was honourably received. Then a Synod was call'd, by the Pope, say the Editors; *Hermannus* says not by whom; though it is scarcely probable that the Pope call'd this Council at *Sutrium*, because in the Case of erroneous Bishops, which, according to *Hermannus*, seems to be the great Cause of this Council, the Infallibility must of Course be call'd in question; and that it certainly was, for *Gratian* (*i. e. Gregory*) was convicted and depriv'd by *Henry*, who, with the Consent of the *Romans* and others, chose a new Pope. By the Consent of the *Romans* and others, must be

be meant the Will and Pleasure of King *Henry*, whose Eloquence at the Head of an Army, and near *Rome*, no Doubt, was very perswading. It is worth while to know what was the Meaning of those Words, *the Case of erroneous Popes.* This I think the Editors Words immediately following make plain: "What was done in this Synod does "not relate to the Three Schismatical depos'd "Bishops:" (Meaning the Three that *Gregory* VI. had brib'd with Pensions to resign.) This is begging the Question, and argues a Jealousy, that the Council of *Sutrium* was call'd to reconcile that Disorder and Confusion which these Schismatical Bishops had occasion'd, and especially *Gregory*, who was punished with Deprivation, and therefore consequently was included in the Number of the *Erroneous* Popes mentioned by *Hermannus.* Whatever the Editors may say to colour over these Inconsistences, they will not pass with any Man in Opposition to the Credit of *Hermannus*, whose Reputation far outshines any of them. Before we leave this Pope, I cannot but take Notice of one Thing, and that is the unjust Comparison of *Gregory* VI. with *Gregory Nazianzen.* If they had carried the *Simile* no farther than the Name, they had done well; but the Circumstance and Action make them very different; for *Gregory Nazianzen* studiously declin'd Episcopal Promotion; and after he had been, as it were, by Force confirmed in the Patriarchal Chair, he voluntarily, and without the least Shadow of Compulsion, resign'd it, and retired to a private Life, which he always affected. But the Case of *Gregory* VI. differs in all Points from this; for whereas *Greg. Nazianzen* studiously declin'd being a Bishop, *Gregory* VI. most industriously sought it, not sticking at the most uncanonical and scandalous Means of obtaining it. And as to the

Part of Abdication, the Editors are as much out in the Application of it, as others have been since in a Temporal Case: For how can he be said to abdicate an Office, who, being a Delinquent both before and after he was in it, is summon'd to a Judicial Trial, where he is convicted, and receives Sentence, which is accordingly executed, and he submits to it. There is a vast Difference between a judicial Proceeding against a Criminal in his Conviction and Punishment, and an innocent Person, that declines Promotion, or voluntarily resigns his Honours, that he may retire nearer to God and his Studies.

[1046.] *Suidger* being chosen Pope by the Interest and Power of *Henry*, is soon consecrated, and takes upon him the Name of *Clement* II. When is no sooner over, than remembring his Benefactor and Maker, he honours, as the Editors call it, *Henry* and *Agnes* his Wife with the Imperial Benediction. Considering Circumstances, he could do no less; for *Henry* made him Pope, and the Pope made him Emperor. Upon the Death of *Clement* II. *Benedict* IX. who had before resign'd, invades the Apostolick See, which he possesses for Eight Months, till

[1048.] *Damasus* II. was presented by the Emperor to it. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 946. Notwithstanding they say, *Damasus* was sent to *Rome*, elected, and consecrated there; yet the Right of Presentation, which they say the Emperor assum'd, and actually executed in this and the last Pope's Presentation to the Holy See, looks as if the Chair of St. *Peter* had quitted or resign'd that Right to the Secular Power. Or else, considering the Services done, and the Interests espous'd by several Popes after their Consecration, it looks too much like Simony, and that they perform'd the End for which they

 were

were promoted by the Secular Power. *Damasus* sat but three and twenty Days, in which Time they date a Council, but they do not say called by the Pope, only in the Title, " The Council " of *Sens*, held by all the Bishops of the Province " in the Presence of *Henry* King of the *Franks*, " *A. D.* 1048." By this it is plain the Council was called by the King, nor was the Pope in the least concern'd in it, for *Guilduin* Archbishop of *Sens* presided in it. Besides, in the Account the Editors give of this Council, they tell us, that the King and Bishops (not naming the Pope) confirm'd the Foundation of the Monastery of St. *Aygulf*, in the City of *Pruim*, built by *Theobald*.

[1049.] Upon the Death of *Damasus* II. *Benedict* IX. who had been brib'd to resign, renews his Claim, but is thrown aside by *Leo* IX.'s Means, on this Occasion: " *Benedict* having forcibly a " Third Time invaded the Apostolick See, the " Cardinals petition the Emperor *Henry* II. to " eject him. Hereupon the Emperor forthwith " elects *Bruno*, (who afterwards called himself " *Leo* IX.) and robeing him with the Pontifical " Purple, dismisses him, that he might go and pre- " sent himself before the Cardinals to be elected " by them." These are the Words of the Editors *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 947. But this Story requires a little Animadversion. As to the Invasion of the Holy See by *Benedict*, the Editors do not much trouble themselves; but the other Part of the Story, which relates to the Manner of Pope *Leo*'s Election by the Emperor, they think requires a little Dressing and Modifying, for it clashes with the Supremacy, and gives too great a Concession and Power to the Temporal Prince, till the Bishop of *Rome* himself is made one. And therefore to colour this over with some Authority, they produce *Otho* Bishop

of

of *Freising*, (a zealous Bigot and Admirer of the Papacy) who gives the foresaid Story a pleasant Turn. " As *Leo* went thro' *Gaul*, says he, it happen'd that he came to *Clugny*, where *Hildebrand* was Prior, who no sooner sees him, but charges him to desist from his Undertaking, affirming it to be unlawful for a Pope to receive the Government of the whole Church from a Lay-Hand; and that if he would be advis'd by him, he would prevent the Imperial Censure, and preserve the Liberty of the Church, by renewing the Election. *Leo* consents to this, and divesting himself of the Purple, travels in the Habit of a Pilgrim, taking *Hildebrand* with him; and when they came to *Rome*, he is by the Counsel of *Hildebrand* chosen Pope by the Clergy and People." So far *Otho*. And thus, say the Editors, *Leo*, in an Apostolick Manner, as it had been revealed to him Five Years by Prophecies and Visions, was lawfully chosen Bishop of *Rome*, *Lab. ib. p.* 947. But notwithstanding all this Varnish, these two Stories, which they would fain make to agree by explaining one by the other, do very much differ in Probability and Fact. For if, as the Editors say, *ibid.* after *Bruno* was elected by the Emperor, that he presented himself to the Assembly of Cardinals, to be elected by them, it looks like the Emperor's recommending, and the Cardinals electing or confirming; then there would have been no Occasion for *Bruno*'s divesting himself of the Purple, and coming to a Re-Election. But if we take these two Stories in Opposition to each other, they plainly contradict one another; for the one says, he presented himself before the Cardinals to be elected, which implies their Acceptation or Confirmation of the Emperor's Choice; The

The other, that he divested himself of the Purple, at the Instigation of *Hildebrand*, and resum'd the Pontificate by a due Election of the Clergy and People; so that one of these must be false. But to come to the Truth of this Story, it is plain, that the Editors introduce *Otho* of *Freising*'s Story for no other End, than to confirm the Power of Investitures in the Pope, and the Elections of Popes in the College of Cardinals, which the Pontificate in this Century seiz'd, and none so fit to be thought the Instrument in this as *Hildebrand*, (afterwards Pope by the Name of *Gregory* VII.) who set his Infallibility right, persuading him to depose himself, and be *lawfully elected Bishop of the* Roman *Church. Lab. ibid.* But of this, more when we come to that Pope's Life. The Editors would seem to excuse the Story of this Pope's marching at the Head of an Army, and fighting the *Normans*, who routed his Army, and took his Holiness Prisoner, by condemning *Peter Damiani*, who wrote an Epistle to *Firminus*, a Bishop, against Pope *Leo*'s waging War, reprehending him for Irregularity; and undoubtedly he was guilty of it, as many Canons both of the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches positively affirm. " But, say they, since the universal Church think " otherwise, it is pardonable in a melancholy " Monk to take such Freedom with the *German* and " *Gallick* Bishops who went armed Cap-a-pe: " *Germanorum & Gallorum loricatos & galeatos Episcopos perstringens. Lab. ib. p.* 948.

As to the Epistles of this Pope, I dare say, they are genuine, the greatest Part of them being Assertions of the Papal Power, assuming a Right of Pre-eminency over all the World: Of which the Third and Fourth are very remarkable Instances. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 972, 973, 974. The Third to *Thomas*, an *African* Bishop, seems to assert the Primacy

of the Archbishop of *Carthage*; and that one *Gummitanus*, another *African* Bishop, ought not to pretend to consecrate Bishops, or call a Provincial Council, without the Primate's Consent: But closes all with the old Topick, *viz.* That it is solely in the Bishop of *Rome* to depose Bishops, and to call General Councils. This is likewise the Burden of the Fourth; but if *Aurelius* Bishop of *Carthage* had been alive with his Suffragans in Council, the Bishop of *Rome* would have found the 42d Canon of the Council of *Carthage*, *A. D.* 419. which Pope *Leo* applies only to *Afric*, to have extended every where; and that it was design'd as a Check upon all Exorbitants who should act out of their own Sphere. But it is too plain, that the *African* Church was brought to a low Ebb, when the Bishop of *Rome* should thus peremptorily dictate to her; for as this Pope says in the Beginning of the Third Epistle, from Two hundred and five Bishops that sat in Council, there were then not above Five in all *Afric*. This Concession would never have been, but at such a Time as the Bishops of the *African* Church were reduc'd, and the exorbitant Power of the Church of *Rome* exalted.

But concerning the Election and Consecration of this Pope, the Editors, out of the Old Book of *Rhemes* publish'd by *Baronius*, speak more plainly than any hitherto. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 1028. "Pope "*Damasus* being dead, the *Romans* send an Embassy "to *Henry* the Emperor, desiring that the vacant "Church might be supplied with a Pastor. The "Emperor hereupon consulting the Bishops and "Nobility of the Empire, found none so fit for "the Office as *Bruno* Bishop of *Toul*, being of a "due Age, good Life, and near a-kin to him. "And accordingly the Ensigns of the Apostolick "Dignity are order'd him, with a Command from "the

" the Emperor that he forthwith repair to *Rome*, " according to the Canons of the Church." Here is a plain and positive Narration of the whole Matter in little, *viz.* That *Bruno* was the Emperor's Kinsman, and he made him Pope. No Election at *Rome*, or Confirmation of what the Emperor had done; but the Emperor made him Pope, and upon that Foot he reign'd as such. Here was no deposing himself, in order to proceed to a new and lawful Election, but a direct Pursuance of his Journey to *Rome*, to take Possession of his new Honour and Charge.

In the Year 1049, this Pope calls a Council at *Rhemes*, at which he himself was present; where, at the Request of the Council, several ancient Decrees relating to Ecclesiastick Discipline are reviv'd; the first of which looks like a Reproach upon this Pope's Accession to the Chair; for it forbids any Ecclesiastick Promotion without the Election of the Clergy and People.

[1055.] There is very little said by the Editors in the Life of Pope *Victor*, besides the pretended Miracle, by which they tell us out of *Lambert* that he escap'd Poisoning, so ridiculous in it self, that it will not bear relating. He is succeeded by

[1057.] *Stephen* IX. who was so unwillingly chosen Pope, that by Force they drew him from his Retirement to St. *Peter*'s, and consecrated him. How unwilling soever this *Frederick* (for such was his Name) might be to accept the Pontificate, let who will judge; but his antecedent Qualifications, especially in Opposition to any Thing that interfer'd with the Power of the *Roman* Pontiff, were such as would indisputably at that Time recommend him to the Possession of St. *Peter*'s Chair, if the Interest of the Clergy and People of *Rome* could prevail; for he and *Humbert* being sent Le-

gates from *Leo* IX. in the Year 1054, to *Constantinople*, they deposed *Michael* the Patriarch, and excommunicated him. Returning into *Italy*, for siding too much with his Brother *Godfry* Duke of *Lorrain*, he so far incurs the Displeasure of the Emperor *Henry*, as to be confin'd to the Monastery of *Cassino*, where he is oblig'd to divest himself of all his Honours, and take upon him the Habit of the Order; where, in the Year 1057, by the Power and Interest of Pope *Victor* II. he is made Abbot, and soon after declar'd Cardinal, and, the Pope dying, he is elected Pope by the Name of *Stephen* IX. The most remarkable Part of his Life, is the Design he had of deposing *Henry* the Emperor, and transferring the Empire to his Brother the Duke of *Lorrain*; which, that he might the more easily bring to pass, he calls a Synod at *Rome*, wherein he declares the Emperor a Heretick, for assuming the Investitures of Bishops, which he claim'd as his Due, at the same Time sending *Hildebrand* into *Germany* to proclaim the same. *Papebroch. Conat. ad Catalog. Pontiff. Par.* 1. *p.* 192. Thus private Interest and Ambition blew the Coals of this fatal Quarrel; and no fitter an Incendiary to carry it on than *Hildebrand*, of whom more hereafter. This *Roman* Council, nor any other in this Pope's Time, is not mentioned by the Editors, but whether thro' Neglect or Design, I shall not affirm: But I am apt to think they did not look upon it as an Addition to the Reputation of Pope *Stephen*, and so might omit it. The Decree of this *Stephen* IX. about the future Election of a Pope, argued the mighty Influence of *Hildebrand*, as well as his growing Greatness in the Court of *Rome*. This Decree, according to the Words of *Leo Ostiensis*, notwithstanding *Hildebrand*'s Power, was not obtained without some Reluctancy. " If Pope *Stephen*, says he, " should

" should die, before *Hildebrand*, Subdeacon of the " Church of *Rome*, should return from the Em- " press, to whom he was sent on an Embassy up- " on the publick Account, that no Body should " presume to elect a Pope, but that the Apostolick " See should be vacant till his Return, to be dis- " posed of by his Advice." Which was accordingly done, tho' not without some Interruption: For the Death of Pope *Stephen* being known, a Number of Seditious by Force make *Mincius* Bishop of *Veletri* Pope, by the Name of *Benedict* X. Upon this the Cardinals fled from the City of *Florence*, where Pope *Stephen* dy'd, and in their Flight they chose *Gerard* Pope, by the Name of

[1058.] *Nicolas* II. " But before they consecrated " him, or let him go to *Rome*, by the Advice of *Hil-* " *debrand*, they (strictly observing Pope *Stephen*'s " Decree) dispatch a Legate to the Empress, to " procure the Emperor's Consent and Approba- " tion, and to eject the Schismatick Pope; fearing " that upon Neglect hereof the Emperor should " think himself affronted, and take Part with the " Schismaticks, which might encrease the Danger " of the Schism. This Advice of *Hildebrand's* " pleas'd, and the Approbation of the Emperor is " no sooner ask'd than obtain'd." *Lab. T. 9. p.* 1090. As yet we see the Bishops of *Rome* could not carry their Point in the Case of electing a Pope, nothing being yet to be done in that Case without the Consent of the Emperor. And though this Pope goes as far as he durst, by a Decree, *ibid. p.* 1103, 1104. impowering the Cardinals, *Electum Episcopum ad Apostolici Culminis Apicem provehant*, to inthrone the elected Bishop; yet, in the next Paragraph, it is done with this Precaution, *Salvo debito Honore & Reverentia dilecti nostri Filii Henrici, &c.* In the same

manner they proceed in the Election of *Anselm*, whom they chose by the Name of

[1061.] *Alexander* II. after an Interregnum of three Months. For when the Death of Pope *Nicolas* was known, the Nobility and People of *Rome* assembling together, sent to the Emperor *Henry* for Leave to choose a Bishop of *Rome*; which, when the Cardinals understood, they did the same; but, say they, against the Law of Nations, they were not admitted. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 1112. However, that they might but seem to carry their Point, rather than be wholly laid aside, they resolve upon a very plausible Expedient to support their Power of Election, and please the Emperor too; for they chose (though they did not like the Man) *Anselm* Pope, by Country a *Milanese*, and Bishop of *Luca*, but a particular Favourite of the Emperor and his Court. But this being carried on without the Emperor's Knowledge or Consent, every one complains of the Wrong done to the Emperor; and, by the Advice of *Guibert* of *Parma*, they chose *Cadalous* Bishop of *Parma* Pope, who had for some Time been excommunicated by Pope *Nicolas*. But this Affair being argued between the Emperor and *Roman* Church's Advocates, *Cadalous* is by a general Consent condemn'd, and *Alexander*'s Election confirm'd. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 1156, *&c.*

The Council of *Mantua*, *A. D.* 1064, looks like a forc'd Acknowledgment of the Editors, to which they give the usual Dress. *ib. p.* 1179. "When "*Cadalous*, say they, was condemn'd at *Rome*, those "of his Party gave Pope *Alexander* continual "Trouble, objecting, that he obtained the Papacy "by Bribery. Then, at the Request of *Anno* "Archbishop of *Colen*, he call'd a Council at *Man*"*tua*, in which he (tho' it was below his Dignity) made his Election appear to be lawful and "just."

" juſt." From hence it is plain, that a Biſhop of *Rome* at this Time was liable to the Cenſure of a Council, notwithſtanding what the Editors ſay of his Juſtification being below his Dignity. It is certain he was in a ſynodical Way called to Account for Bribery, and oblig'd to purge himſelf by Oath. *ib. p.* 1180. And here I cannnot omit *Binius*'s Blunder, who firſt affirms *Cadalous* the Pſeudopope to be preſent at this Council by Order of *Anno* Archbiſhop of *Colen*, and then immediately after, in the Words of *Arragonius*, which he ſubjoins, ſays, " That being touch'd with Remorſe of Conſcience, he did not appear. *ibid.*

[1073.] We are come now to the Reign of thundering Pope *Gregory* VII. before called *Hildebrand.* He was a *Tuſcan* by Nation, and of mean Parentage, his Father being a Smith by Trade. Whilſt he was but a Lad in his Father's Shop, and igorant of Letters, he by meer Accident fram'd theſe Words out of little Bits of Wood: *His Dominion ſhall be from one Sea to the other.* This is told of him by *Brietius*, *ad An.* 1073. as a Prognoſtick of his future Greatneſs; but the flattering Jeſuit had made the Story more *a propos* to the Circumſtances of the Perſon, if he had ſaid, that *Hildebrand* had thus accidentally framed theſe Words out of Bits of Iron, becauſe it was done in his Father's Shop, who was a Smith, and conſequently wrought in Iron, not Wood. He was without Doubt a Youth of quick Parts, and a very aſpiring Genius, as will appear by the Sequel of his Life. He received his *Education* from *Laurence* Archbiſhop of *Amalfi*, notorious for his Skill in Magick, and *Gregory* VI. who laboured under the ſame ſcandalous Imputation; by whom he was afterwards made Subdeacon of the Church of *Rome.* In the Year 1047, he follow'd his depoſed Maſter *Grego-*

ry VI. into *Germany*, from whence going into *France*, he took up in the Monastery of *Cluni*, where in a short Time he was made Prior. I shall wave the many and great Employments he obtain'd and enjoy'd in the several Pontificates he lived under, till he was invested with the Sacred Purple. In the Year 1073, on the 30th of *June*, he was consecrated, tho' for Twenty Years before he may be said to have sat at the Helm of the Holy See, acting as arrogantly as any Pope; for all Things were manag'd by his Order and Direction. In short, he was a Man of a fierce and haughty Spirit, govern'd by nothing but Pride and Ambition, the Fury and Scourge of the Age he lived in, and the most insolent Tyrant of the Christian World; that could dream of nothing less than the promoting St. *Peter*'s Regale by the Addition of Scepters and Diadems. And in this Regard he may be said to be the first *Roman* Pontiff that ever made an Attempt upon the Rights of Kings and Princes. Hence proceeded those thundering Anathema's, those direful Curses, that were shower'd on the Heads of Emperors and Kings. Hence those many Barbarities, Slaughters, Poisons, unnatural Parricides, and other horrible and flagitious Practices, as the Age they were committed in could not sufficiently deplore, nor the present Time reflect upon without Horror and Amazement. But these we will take according to the Series of Time they were transacted in, or as we occasionally meet with them.

After a short Historical Account of the former Part of this Pope's Life, and a Miracle or two, the Editors seem concern'd to take off the Imputation of an undue Election of him, objected against him especially by Cardinal *Benno* and *Conrade* Abbot of *Urspergh*, who charge him directly

 with

with Simony. And then, to confirm *Gregory* VI. in the Catalogue of Popes, (who is not allow'd by all) they tell us, that *Hildebrand* took upon him the Name of *Gregory* VII. purely out of Gratitude and Respect to his Patron and Preceptor *Gregory* VI. calling himself *Gregory* VII. which implies a *Gregory* VI. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1, 2, 3, *&c.*

A. D. 1073. he begins with *Philip* King of *France.* whom he threatens with Excommunication, and the Loss of his Kingdom, for Simony and other Crimes. And the Year following he writes to the Bishops, commanding them, if the King would not obey, to resist him, and to put the whole Kingdom under Interdiction; and if he should persist, to deprive him. Excellent Advice to Subjects against their Prince! *Ibid. p.* 72. There are several Epistles of this Strain in the like Case against the Emperor *Henry* IV. His First Epistle, *l.* 4. *To all Christians,* charges his Subjects to resist him. His Second, to *Herimannus* Bishop of *Metz,* sets the Pontificate above the *Regale.* And the Third, to the *Germans,* obliges them to choose another in the Room of *Henry* IV. unless he remov'd his evil Councellors from him, and repented. *Ibid.* *p.* 147, 149, 151. All these are only to confirm the Usurpation of the Pontificate, in laying Claim to and disposing of all Crowns, whose Owners will not go their Lengths. According to this Scheme, this Pope in his First Year writes to the Princes of *Spain,* signifying his Leave to Count *Evulus* to possess that Part of *Spain* which he had taken from the *Saracens.* But it is scarcely credible, that that Man, who had the Bravery to purchase with his Sword any Country from an Enemy, would ask the Pope's Leave to possess or enjoy what he had thus manfully obtain'd, and especially from heathenish Invaders. But whether this Leave

were

were ask'd, or given unask'd, (no Matter which) here is an Epistle for a Precedent, to shew what the Bishop of *Rome* could do at a Distance; and therefore we are not to wonder, that he could prevail so much in *Italy*, as to make *Richard* Prince of *Capua*, *A. D.* 1073, take a formal Oath of Allegiance to him in these Words: "I *Richard*, by the "Grace of God and St. *Peter*, Prince of *Capua*, "from this Hour and henceforward will be faith-"ful to the Holy Church of *Rome* and the Apo-"stolick See, and to my Lord *Gregory*, Universal "Bishop, *&c.*" *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 23. The next Instance of this Kind is in the Year following; when Pope *Gregory* writes to *Solomon* King of *Hungary*, whom he reprimands severely for acknowledging his Kingdom as a Fife of the Empire, which he challenges as a Property of the *Roman* Church, and a peculiar Right of St. *Peter*; assuring him withal, that unless he retracted his Error, and own'd himself a Feudal of the Ecclesiastick, not Imperial, Majesty, he should not long enjoy it. *Ibid.* 81. The same Year likewise he attacks *Robert Guiscard* Duke of *Apulia* and *Calabria*, whom he chastises with an armed Force, and compels to make Reparations for Injuries done to St. *Peter's Regale*.

This Year likewise there were several Synods call'd in *Italy* about the married Clergy; whose Marriage, notwithstanding God had pleas'd to call a Holy Ordinance, they profanely call Concubinage, and forbid it the Clergy, calling that Incontinency which St. *Paul* prescribes as a Remedy against it. This Decree of Pope *Gregory* VII.'s is sent to the Council of *Erfurdt* in *Duringen* in *Saxony*, where it is no sooner promulg'd, but the Clergy set themselves most furiously in Opposition to it, as *Lambert Schaffnaberg*, *Chron. p.* 506. handsomly expresses

presses in these Words: "The whole Clergy strenuously oppose this Decree, calling *Gregory* VII, "downright Heretick and Madman, who had forgotten the Words of the Apostle, *He that cannot "contain himself, let him marry; for it is better to marry than to burn*; who by a violent Exaction demanded from Men cloathed with Flesh and "Blood to live the Life of Angels; and yet whilst "he thus pretended to deny Nature her lawful Liberty, encouraged Fornication and Uncleanness: But if he persisted in the Prosecution of "this Sentence, they were resolved to quit the "Priesthood rather than dissolve their Marriage-"Vows; and then he might see what Angels he "could get to govern the Church." When the Archbishop of *Mentz* found that he could prevail neither with Perswasions nor Threatnings, he dissolved the Synod, after having declared the Pope's Decree. This Pope's proceeding with such Vehemence against the married Clergy, and calling their Marriage Concubinage, argues a most hard and impenetrable Front; for at the same Time there were not only strong Presumptions and Suspicions of his Incontinency with *Mathilda*, but he was likewise accused of it; which the Editors tell us was charged upon him, but they do not clear him of it, only at Random, as in the like Cases they assert, but do not prove, so here they call it Malice, and leave it.

In *October*, *A. D.* 1075, *Sigefrid* Archbishop of *Mentz* calls a Council there, at which was the Bishop of *Curia*, who was commission'd by the Pope, upon Pain of Degradation and Loss of his Orders, to compel all the Presbyters of his Diocese forthwith to renounce their Wives, or quit their Office: Which whilst he was labouring to bring about, the Clergy so unanimously with Tongue and Hand be-

labour'd

labour'd and attack'd him, that he had much to do to escape with Life. Wherefore frighted with the Difficulty of the Enterprize, and not daring to proceed in it, he left the Execution of the Sentence to his Holiness. *Lambert, Schaffn. p.* 515.

About the End of this Year the Feud began to grow high between the Pope and the Emperor. The Pope writes a chiding Letter to the Emperor for communicating with Excommunicates; wonders that in his Letters and Embassies he should profess himself so devoted to the Interest of the Church, and at the same Time act against it, and refuse Obedience to his Decrees. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 137. But a little after, *ib. p.* 147. he forbids all Communion with the Emperor; and *p.* 149. in a Letter to him, he excommunicates all, Bishops and Laicks, who communicate with him; asserts the Rights of excommunicating Kings by the Authority and Example of Holy Popes; and pretends to demonstrate, that the Bishops of *Rome* are above crown'd Heads; still promising Absolution if he would return; inviting him to *Rome* to purge and reconcile himself: Which the Emperor refusing, the Pope perswades the *Saxons* to rebel; as did also several Princes and Bishops of *Germany*; which the Emperor hearing, and that they were about to meet at *Tribur* to choose an Emperor, he was reconcil'd to the Pope, coming in Person to *Rome* to receive Absolution. But returning to *Germany*, at the Instigation of Schismaticks, and the Favourers of Concubinage, (for that's the best Term they can give to Marriage) he relaps'd. Thus the Editors, *T.* 10. *p.* 5. who notwithstanding they do upon all Occasions set the Mitre above the Crown; yet in the very following Words in the foremention'd Page, they seem unwilling to set the Pope at the Head of so base an Action as the deposing of

Henry,

Henry, and placing *Rodolph* of *Sweden* in his Room; but say, That the Emperor and *Guibert*, with certain other Rebels, (for with them Princes may be Rebels to their Subjects) having contriv'd a most foul Conspiracy against the Pope, the Princes of *Germany*, without consulting Pope *Gregory*, chose *Rodolph*; which is absolutely false, as will appear in the Sequel of this Story from the Editors themselves.

The Quarrel running so high between the Emperor and Pope, that nothing but Deposition will satisfy the Contenders, the Emperor calls a Council at *Wormes*, *A. D.* 1076. The Account of which we will take from the Editors in *Lambert Schaffnaberg*'s own Words. " The Emperor being very " much enrag'd at the Pope's Letter, (*T.* 10. *p.* 137.) " sends back the Legates with the utmost Con- " tempt, and commands all the Bishops and Ab- " bots throughout his Kingdom to meet him at " *Wormes*, there to consult about deposing the Bi- " shop of *Rome*, upon which he knew his own " Safety and the Establishment of his Kingdom " depended. The King and the Clergy met at " the Time appointed; when, to put a helping " Hand to this great Affair, there came likewise " one *Hugh*, a Cardinal of the Church of *Rome*, " Sirnamed *Blancus*, whom the Pope a few Days " before had deposed for certain Follies and Im- " moralities. This Person contributed much to " the facilitating the Matter; for by a certain De- " sign, in the Nature of a Tragedy, he sets forth " his Original, Youth, Manhood, irregular Ad- " vancement to the Apostolick See, and several " other notorious Practices. In short, Letters are " sent in the Name of all the Bishops and Abbots " to the Bishop of *Rome*, wherein he is order'd to " quit the Apostolick See, which he had unlawful-

" ly

" ly usurp'd; and to know, that after that Day, " whatever he should pretend to do as Bishop of " *Rome*, would be look'd on as invalid." The Pope, to be quit with the Emperor, in a Synod at *Rome* the same Year excommunicates him, and several Bishops of his Party, citing the rest to appear at *Rome*. The Emperor hereupon retorts the *Anathema* of the *Roman* Synod. Thus they continued piqueering at each other till the Year 1079, or 1080, when in a *Roman* Synod the Empire, as forfeited by *Henry*, was transferr'd to *Rodolph* of *Sweden*; on this Condition, that no Lay-person whatever should hereafter pretend to the Investitures of Benefices; sending him at the same Time a Crown of Gold, with this Verse inscrib'd:

Petra dedit Petro, Petrus Diadema Rodulpho.

Thus the Investitures followed the Fate of Crowns; nor were they likely to continue free, when the rightful Disposers of them were subjected. In this Council, there were Two severe Decrees made to secure the Right of Investitures in the Church. The First, threatening Deposition and Excommunication to any Person that should accept of a Bishoprick or Abbey from a Lay-person. The Second, that if any Emperor, King, or other Secular Person, should pretend to take upon him the Investiture of a Bishoprick, or any Ecclesiastick Dignity, he should be liable to the same Sentence. Thus Pope *Gregory* riveted the Point he had so long aim'd at, and which he left so secure to his Successors, that to this Day it remains firm and entire, except in those Countries which have shaken off the *Roman* Yoke.

The same Year a Council begun at *Mentz*, and ended at *Brescia* in *Lombardy*, wherein *Gregory* is de-

pos'd, and *Guibert* Archbishop of *Ravenna* put in his Room. The Conclusion of this Synod's Decree is very sharp, than which nothing can be more sarcatical, or render a humane Creature more monstrous. After they had pass'd Sentence, they give these Reasons, according to *Conrad. Urspergens. in Chron. ad An.* 1080. *p.* 171. " Because (say they) " it's plain he is not chosen of God, but of him- " self, by the Corruption and Power of Money: " One who has subverted Ecclesiastick Order, and " disturbed the Peace of the Christian World, and " hath plotted Ruin of Body and Soul to a Catho- " lick peaceable King: A Defender of perjured " Princes: A Sower of Discord among quiet Peo- " ple, of Scandal among the Brethren, and a Se- " parator of Man and Wife. Calling him besides, " Presumptuous, Sacrilegious, Incendiary, Perjur'd, " a Friend of Murtherers, Necromancer, false Pro- " phet, *&c.*" But they will say, perhaps, this comes from an Enemy and a Schismatick, as they call *Conrad Ursperg.* But though it does, and that *Conrad* takes it from Cardinal *Benno*, another that was no Friend of the Pontificate; yet let them consider, that *Benno* lived in those Times, and was the better able to give the Truth of the Circumstances and Characters of Men than more modern Authors, and at a greater Distance of Time. Nor do I think the Decree at *Brixen* in *Germany* comes short of *Conrad*, which calls him " Deserting Monk, " Corrupter of the holy Philosophy with new " Opinions, a Disturber of the Peace; that con- " founds together Things Sacred and Profane, Di- " vine and Humane, both which he equally adul- " terates: One that is Accuser, Witness, and Judge, " at the same Time; parting Man and Wife, and " preferring Fornication, Adultery, and Incest, to " lawful Wedlock: Calling him besides, False

" Monk,

" Monk, Magician, Quack in Divinity, Whim-
" ſical Dreamer, wavering in the Chriſtian Reli-
" gion, *&c.*" as may be ſeen in the *Senat. Conſult. apud Annal. Boair, l.* 5. *p.* 569, *&* 579.

In the Twelfth *Roman* Council, which was in the Year 1074, Pope *Gregory* VII. ſhews the End for which the Decretal Epiſtles of former Popes were forg'd. Pope *Marcellus*, as has been ſaid *ad An.* 304. was ſo obſcure, that neither *Euſebius* or *Theodorit* knew any Thing of him. And it is too plain that there was no ſuch Perſon, his Name being only thruſt into the Catalogue of Popes to fill up a Vacancy, ; and conſequently all Epiſtles and Decrees aſcrib'd to him muſt be fictitious. Yet becauſe theſe Decretal Epiſtles make for the Supremacy, as may be ſeen in the Hints on this Pope's Life at the Year aforeſaid, and though *Bellarmine* and others are ſo far from aſſerting them to be genuine, that they will not affirm them to be ſuch, yet the Editors are not aſhamed to ſet Pope *Gregory* VII. (though their moſt early Darling) in the Front of moſt notorious Forgeries and Lies. In the Third Chapter of this Council, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 217. ſpeaking of the Obſervation of *Roman* Pontiffs Decrees, as being of more Authority than the Four Firſt General Councils, and that thoſe Councils had been invalid without the Sanction of the Apoſtolick See, they bring in Pope *Marcellus* (who never was) to confirm this ; ſaying, " This Bleſ-
" ſed Pope, who before the *Nicene* Council ſign'd
" his Decrees with Martyrdom, in the Eleventh
" Chapter ſays, The Apoſtles themſelves, and
" their Succeſſors, by the Inſpiration of the Lord,
" decreed, That there ſhould be no Synod with-
" out the Authority of the See of *Rome.*" This is the very laſt Degree of Impudence and Profaneneſs ; for it is moſt certain, that there is no Part of the

the New Teſtament that mentions any Thing of this Nature. But, I ſuppoſe, this is foiſted in with Deſign to countenance the following Chain of Untruths in this Chapter; for, in the firſt Place, he that believes this *Marcellus* to have been Pope, will believe all is father'd on him, tho' to the perverting, by Addition or Diminution, any Text of Scripture; (for whoever ſits in St. *Peter*'s Chair cannot err, though he turn Heretick or Heathen) and then all Stories or Forgeries of leſs Note go down without Scruple. A plain Conſequence of which we have in the ſame Chapter, *ibid p.* 317. "St. *Athanaſius*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, who made no mean "Figure in the Council of *Nice*, in his Epiſtle to "Pope *Felix*, ſays thus: We know that it was de-"termined in the great Council of *Nice*, That no "Councils ought to be held without the Conſent "of the Biſhop of *Rome*." This is not the firſt Falſity impoſed upon *Athanaſius*, as has been ſhewn in the Papacy of Pope *Mark*, *ad An.* 336. Beſides, it is falſe in another Part, for we have already ſhewn ſeveral Councils called and held without the Pope's Knowledge and Conſent, and never ſent to him to be confirm'd. This Chapter goes on to prove by their own Popes, that no Council ought to be held without their Leave, ſaying, *That Canonical Authority, Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, and the Holy Fathers, all agree in this*; till it comes to the Preſident of the Firſt *Nicene* Council, in which they will have *Hoſius* and two Presbyters to be the Pope's Legates, and preſide. But this we have already cleared in the Papacy of *Silveſter*, *ad An.* 314. And as for the Confirmation of this Council, this Chapter differs very much from the Preface or Hiſtory of the Council of *Nice*, (as they call it.) *Lab. T.* 11. *p.* 6, & 67.

This Chapter ſays, That the Three Legates aforeſaid confirm'd it by their Subſcription; and the

Preface and Notes ſay, that this Council writ a Letter to *Silveſter* for his Confirmation, and that he called a Council at *Rome*, and writ back, to ratify what they had done. But theſe Epiſtles are moſt infamous Forgeries, as appear plainly by the Barbarity of the Style, and Intricacy of the Senſe. *Lab. ib. p.* 68. *Bin. p.* 348. *col.* 1. Beſides, in the Margin aforeſaid, *Labbé* tells us they are Fictions, and *Baronius* will not affirm them to be genuine, *An.* 325. *n.* 37. And tho' *Binius* in his Notes, *p.* 348. *col.* 1. *in Marg.* cites them for Evidence; yet, *p.* 365. *col.* 1. *Not. ad. Concil. Rom.* tells us, *It is evident they are both corrupted*; and again he ſays, *If they were not both extream faulty and commentitious, they might be Evidence in this Caſe.* But *Richerius*, the honeſt *Sorboniſt, in Hiſt. Concil. l.* 1. *c.* 2. § 6. ingenuouſly declares, That *theſe Epiſtles are prodigiouſly falſe*, the Forger of them being ſo ignorant as to call *Macarius* (who was then Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*) Biſhop of *Conſtantinople.* Such unfair Dealing as this, and from a Pope at the Head of a Council, and in a ſpecial Decree, is enough to prejudice any reaſonable Man againſt the pretended Authority which the Biſhops of *Rome* have aſſumed; and it deſerves no meaner a Reprehenſion, than to tax them with the higheſt Impudence for palming upon the World falſe Citations of Hiſtory, which every Capacity can contradict. *Vid. Synopſ. Can. Eccleſ. Latin. Annot. p.* 53, 54. From all theſe Falſities this Chapter concludes, "That we ought to pay the ſame, nay greater Deference, if poſſible, to the Apoſtolick Decrees, than we pay to the Four firſt General Councils, ſince without the Apoſtolick Authority they are invalid." But this Concluſion no Man in his Senſes will allow, that has read or heard of the Premiſſes; except it be thoſe of their own Perſuaſion, who deny themſelves the Liberty and Uſe of their Senſes.

In

In the Year 1078. Pope *Gregory* VII. held a Council at *Rome*, wherein he endeavours to fix the sole Right and Power of Investitures in the Apostolick See, and which by frequently repeated Attempts he at last obtained. And notwithstanding in several Canons, made in this Council, he rubs very hard upon many of his Predecessors, and even upon himself in the Case of Simony and other Crimes; yet he shews not so much Concern for any Thing as the Investitures, and which he places in the Front of these Canons. But whatever Pope *Gregory* design'd (whose Ambition was vastly aspiring) the Editors seem to have a Mind to out-do him, and in the Case of Investitures too; otherwise they would not take upon them to insert what they seem to have no Authority for. In the Beginning of this Council there are inserted Three and thirty Titles of Canons, which Canons themselves are lost, and only the Twelve following left. Very good Fortune truly, that the Two first of these Twelve, which concern and settle Investitures in the Pontificate, should escape. But then I would gladly know, how that Addition came to be annex'd to the Second Canon, and which *Labbé* says in the Margin, *T.* 10. *p.* 373. his great Favourite *Hugo Flaviniacensis* has not in his Chronicle. Indeed considering the Texture of the Thing, it looks like an intended Insertion, and is thus: " Which if any " shall presume, *(meaning the taking Investitures of* " *Churches from a Lay-Hand)* let him know, that " such Investiture is void by Apostolick Authority, " and that he shall stand excommunicated till he " has made plenary Satisfaction." I must confess, since *Labbé* would oblige the World to believe him in the great Character he gives this *Hugo Flaviniac*, calling him in *T.* 9. the *Incomparable Treasure* of the Eleventh Century, I am as willing to believe him

in his own marginal Note aforesaid; and that since this latter Part of the Second Canon, relating to the Right of Investitures in the Apostolick See not being in his beloved *Hugo*'s *Incomparable Treasure*, I am very inclinable to believe they are his, or his Friend *Binius*'s, or belong to some such affectionate Favourer and Champion of the Pontificate. And this I am the more apt to conclude from *Labbe* himself, who publish'd this *Hugo*'s Chronicle from the Original MSS. in the *Claromontan* Library, wherein he has not acted the Part of a fair Editor; for in the former Part he hath left out many vulgar Things, and at the same Time transcrib'd from some others several useless trifling Scraps, which no honest and ingenuous Lover of Ecclesiastick History can ever be thought to deplore the Want of. Had *Hugo* been that valuable Treasure, his Admirer *Labbe* had the less Occasion to correct him; and if there had been any Thing *vulgar*, a small Note would have excus'd it: But then after all to play the Part of an Inserter, looks not fair; and that Editor which shall insert in one Thing, may justly be suspected to do so in another; and therefore if *Labbé* is faulty, either in Imagination or in Fact, he has brought the Disgrace upon himself. *Cav. Hist. Lit. Par.* 1. *p.* 636.

The Affair of Investitures is again and again over-hal'd by the Editors themselves, as well as by the Popes; and *Labbé* is so fond of the nauseous Flattery his Favourite *Hugo Flaviniac* bestows on this Pope, that he cannot forbear transcribing more of it than he or his Historian can prove in the Character of this Pope, and especially in the Business of Investitures, which, he says, having been unlawfully usurp'd by the Laity, he restored to the Church. *T.* 10. *p.* 375. Indeed, as to Investitures, he wrested them, partly by Force, partly be Ecclesiastical

ſiaſtical Cenſures, out of the Hands of the Laity; which cannot fairly be called Reſtitution, for that implies a former Right. Beſides, how can *Labbé* or his Friend *Hugo* ſay, That Inveſtitures had been unlawfully uſurp'd by the Laity, when the Right of them very often was only in the Laity. This is plain from ſome Canons, which in old Time gave the Founders of Churches the Liberty of diſpoſing of them; that is, of Preſenting a Prieſt, with the Approbation of the Biſhop. I am ſure it was a violent Uſurpation in Pope *Gregory* to wreſt this Right from thoſe in whom it was inveſted.

But to go through with the Matter, Pope *Gregory* again in a *Roman* Synod, *A. D.* 1080. depoſing the Emperor *Henry*, and placing *Rodulph* in his Room, he repeats the Chapters or Canons relating to Inveſtitures in the XVth *Roman* Council. To which is added, a Directory for the Election of a Pope, which, becauſe it was ſeldom (if ever) obſerv'd, I ſhall inſert. "As often as the Paſtor of "any Church ſhall die, another is to be canoni-"cally put in his Room, at the Inſtance of the "Biſhop Viſiter, who receives his Orders from the "Apoſtolick or Metropolitan See; and the Cler-"gy and People laying aſide all Secular Ambition, "Fear, or Favour, ſhall chooſe for themſelves a "Paſtor according to the Will of God, and with "the Conſent of the Apoſtolick or Metropolitan "See. But if there be any Corruption in the Caſe, "the Election ſhall be void." If we look back or forward into the Elections of the Biſhops of *Rome*, what Briberies, what Murders, what enormous Irregularities have there been acted at moſt of them! And we need not go far back for foul and undue Elections. The Editors themſelves tell us, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1,2. *in Marg.* That the Popes *Nicolas* and *Alexander* II. were elected by *Hildebrand*'s Means;

 for

for he commanded that *Bruno*, afterwards *Leo* IX. should be elected; and it is not to be questioned, but that he, who by his mighty Influence could command the Election of others, and who, for Twenty Years before his own Advancement, had govern'd the Church of *Rome* as arbitrarily as if himself had been Pope, could easily make use of the same Means to thrust himself into St. *Peter's* Chair when he saw Opportunity. So that *Labbé* and his Friend *Hugo Flaviniac.* might have spar'd their Pains in dawbing so much Flattery on the Man, as saying, *He was consecrated in Righteousness and Holiness.*

This Year likewise the Editors pretend a Council at *Langres*, which, because it was held (as they say) in Opposition to Lay-Investitures, they will thrust in; though, as they acknowledge, they have little Ground for it: For *Labbé, T.* 10. *p.* 397, introducing this Council with a *Some* (he knows not who, nor from whence) *who asserts there was a Council held at* Langres *against Lay-Investitures*; immediately corrects himself, and says, "*Hugo Flaviniac.* who liv'd in those Times, and strictly knew "the Life and Actions of *Hugo* Bishop of *Dian*, "who presided in this Council, takes no Notice "of it." Which is as much as to say, if he durst have spoken out, that he did not believe what he had first asserted: But because it looks with an evil Eye on Lay-Investitures, it must be put in, tho' without any Authority. It's not to be questioned, but that *Hugo Flaviniac.* whom *Labbé* so much ador'd, and who was a great Advocate for the Pontificate, would have taken Notice of this Council, if there had been any such in his Time.

The Year following, and in the Year 1084, Pope *Gregory* pursues the Emperor and his Party

with repeated Anathema's, which receive their final Confirmation, *A. D.* 1085, in the Council of *Quintilinburg*; where, tho' they suffer'd a certain Clergyman of *Bamberg* named *Gunibert* to question the Pope's Supremacy and Infallibility, they over-rul'd him with this General Maxim, *The Disciple is not above his Master*, and that, *the Greater ought not to be judged of the Less*; at the same Time ratifying the two foresaid Points, producing the Decrees of the Holy Fathers in Behalf of the Supremacy of the Apostolick See, and that it was not lawful for any to question the Judgment of its Bishop. In the End of this Synod, the Sentence of Anathema is pronounc'd with lighted Candles against *Guibert*, as an Invader of the Holy See, *Hugo Albus*, and *John* of *Portus*, Anticardinals, and Favourers of *Guibert*, with several others of the same Party. To revenge which, in the Month of *May* the same Year, the Emperor *Henry*, in a Royal and Synodal Assembly at *Mentz*, demands of all there present to sign the Deposition of *Hildebrand*, and approve of the Ordination of *Guibert*. Thus these two contending Parties null'd and unravel'd what each had done in Opposition to the other, till *Gregory* VII. after a troublesome Twelve Years Pontificate, was forc'd to quit the Stage of the World, and leave the Greatness of the Court of *Rome* (whose Foundation he had with much Art and Labour laid) to be enlarg'd by his Successors; and which they as industriously pursued as he had begun. Accordingly,

[1086.] Pope *Victor* III. is appointed by *Gregory* VII. as his Successor; who, considering the grand Designs of *Gregory*, was the fittest Person to succeed him. He was the only Son of the Prince of *Beneventum*, being at first called *Dauferius*, afterwards *Desiderius*, and when chosen Pope, he assum'd the

Name of *Victor* III. He was first a Monk in the Monastery of *Cassinum*, of which in the Year 1056, he was made Abbot. Afterwards, in the Year 1059, he was by Pope *Nicolas* II. ordained Priest, and likewise made a Cardinal. He was very fond of a Monastick Life, and yet a zealous Asserter of what Advantages the Pontificate had gain'd upon the Regale. He very honourably received *Gregory* VII. in his Flight from *Rome* at his Monastery, *A. D.* 1084, at which Time *Gregory* was so charm'd with him, that the Year following, at his Death, he appointed him his Successor. Notwithstanding which, and the Consent of the Bishops and Cardinals in the Election, after a Year's Retirement to his Monastery, he was not without great Importunity persuaded to take the Papacy upon him in the Council of *Capua*. But when he had once accepted the Chair, he set himself as heartily to the great Work his Predecessor had begun as any of them; for being consecrated in *May*, the *August* following he called a Council at *Beneventum*, in which he anathematizes *Guibert* the Antipope with his Adherents, forbids Conversation with Excommunicates, condemns Lay-Investitures, and threatens all Bishops, Abbots, and Clergy, who shall receive any Benefice or Dignity from Lay-Hands, with Excommunication. But his Reign being short, he could not be expected to go far in answering the Expectation of *Gregory* VII. However he gave a Tast of his Inclinations, and what he left unfinish'd, his Successors as carefully pursu'd. As for the Manner of his Death, the Editors in the Life of this Pope are silent, being, I suppose, unwilling to own it was by Poison, lest the World should expect the Reason of it; and therefore they only say, *That he went to the Lord.* But the Addition of *Labbé* to this Pope's Life sets this Affair in another Light; and which makes no small

ſmall Diſcoveries too in other Incroachments. The Firſt is in the Caſe of the dying Pope's nominating his Succeſſor: The Second in the Cardinals more particularly being concerned in the Election of the Pope. The true Reaſon undoubtedly was to bring theſe into Precedents, though never ſo foul and indirect, otherwiſe they would not ſo roughly have introduced them, and accompanied them with ſo black and irregular Circumſtances. The Life of Pope *Victor* owns, that Pope *Gregory* VII. at his Death named *Deſiderius* his Succeſſor; which *Labbé* confirms out of his Favourite *Hugo Flaviniac. Chron. p.* 232. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 413. "Our Lord, "Pope *Gregory*, ſays he, of Bleſſed Memory, be-"ing detain'd at *Salernum* by a grievous Sickneſs, "of which he afterwards died, the Biſhops and "*Roman* Cardinals met, intreating him to name "his Succeſſor; and he, pauſing a little, replied, "*Chooſe whom ye will of theſe Three, the Biſhop of* "Oſtia, Luca, *or* Lyons." This is quite contrary to the Practice of the *Roman* Church to this Time; for when there was a free Election of a Biſhop of *Rome*, (which, according to the Editors, was but ſeldom) it was by the *Clergy and People of* Rome; (they are their Words:) And when any Emperor or King nominated a Biſhop to them, (as the *Gothick* Kings for the moſt Part did) ſtill the Election went in the Name of the *Clergy and People of* Rome. And leſt this ſhould grow cold, they are reſolved, by a quick Repetition of it, to work it into a Cuſtom, as we ſhall ſee in the Pontificate of *Urban* II. the next Pope. The Cardinals being here named, both in the Life of *Victor* II. and in the above-cited Place of *Hugo Flaviniac.* is with no other Deſign than to have it taken Notice of, that in this Pope's Election only the Biſhops and Cardinals are made uſe of; for by this Time the Cardinals

dinals were incorporated into a College, and therefore high Time for them to exert and shew themselves. But the Citation of *Labbé* out of *Hugo Flaviniac.* is but Part of his Addition to this Pope's Life; for at the End of it he says: "After *Gregory*, "*Desiderius* the Abbot of *Cassinum*, taking upon "him the Papacy, call'd himself *Victor*." Now what Sort of Election, Promotion, and Consecration his was, *Hugo* Bishop of *Lyons* very plainly expresses in his Epistle to the Countess *Matilda*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 414, 415. in these Words: "As to the "Election of the Abbot of *Cassinum*, you were suf-"ficiently appris'd of it before I came to *Rome*, to "which I, and several of my Brethren, Sons of "the Holy *Roman* Church, preferring the Glory "of Man to that of God, consented." Here was a wicked Connivance and Consent, and which the subsequent Words explain; for, *ibid. p.* 414. this same *Hugo* of *Lyons* repeats several notorious Facts which Pope *Victor* reported of himself, and in a boasting Manner, in the Presence of the Bishops and Cardinals: "Such as his having sworn "to the Emperor *Henry* to assist him in obtaining "the *Roman* Empire; and that it was at his Insti-"gation and Perswasion that *Henry* invaded the "Territories of St. *Peter*, and advanced to *Rome*. "How often hath he openly with his own Mouth "not only invalidated the Decrees of his Master, "Pope *Gregory*, and other Holy Fathers, but null'd "them in Fact? And in how many Places has "he affirmed, that his Election was not according "to the Will of God, but tumultuously done, *&c?*" But perhaps they will say this was to put by the Election, he being more fond of a Monastick Life. Certainly no Man can be compell'd in this Case: But supposing this Election to be an Act of Force, his Way of eluding it was foul and scandalous; for if

if the Stories he tells of himself, with Design to put off or null the Election, were true, he makes himself a very infamous Traytor to the Cause he professes; but if false, he tells so many Untruths, which are not only a scandalous Slander on the Character of others, but doing a notorious publick Evil to procure a private Good to himself, in a lazy useless Retirement. The rest of his Character from the same Author is still as black and scandalous; for *ibid. p.* 415. he says, "That being "summoned to the Council of *Capua*, he and "others obey'd: Where, as they were proceeding "to an Election, they found the Abbot (*i. e. Victor* III.) wheedling and cajoling the Electors to "force him to accept the Papacy; which Trick "of his being soon found out, the Bishops that "were summoned to the Election with *Witmund* "the Monk, contriv'd how to outwit him: Therefore just as he was ready to resume the Ensigns "of the Pontificate, and to re-accept the Election "so often declined by him, the foresaid Party began to exclaim against the Levity of the Abbot, "declaring in the Hearing of all, that they would "not give their Consent, unless he submitted to "a Canonical Examination, and cleared his Reputation of some Things charged upon him "since his Election: Which he taking in great "Disdain, declared he would neither submit to "an Examination, nor accept of the Election; "by this Means giving Opportunity for a new "Election. Wherefore *Witmund* the Monk, by "the Advice of the Bishop of *Ostia*, publickly "cry'd out, That so infamous a Person ought not "to be elected or ordained Bishop of *Rome*, since "it was plain beyond Dispute that he was so, because he stood excommunicated a whole Year "by Pope *Gregory*, and had done no Canonical

"Pen-

"Pennance." A few Lines further the same Author goes on with this *Victor*'s Character, *ibid. p.* 415. telling, "How the Abbot, void of Grace, had "conspired with the Governor, who were both "reconciled, on Condition that the Abbot should "be Pope, and his Friend *Alfan* be made Bishop "of *Salernum*. The next Day after Dinner, the "Abbot, and others, having taken a Nap after a "Debauch, (*Vino obtinente superiora, ib.*) the Abbot "[Oh horrid!] declares himself, being supported "by the Interest of the Governor, the Bishop of "*Ostia*, and all the rest of us ignorant of the Mat-"ter. Things going on at this Rate, the Bishop "of *Ostia*, who hitherto agreed with us in all "Things, as soon as he saw that the Abbot, thro' "the Power of Prince *Jordan*, intended to go to "*Rome* to be consecrated, fearing the Loss of his "Dignity, if the Abbot should be consecrated by "another Hand, tacks about, and forgetting his "Promise and Contract with us, to his utter "Shame, makes his Peace with the Abbot, and "pays him the Reverence due to a Pope.—There-"fore being thus consecrated by the Bishop of "*Ostia*, as he was saying Mass at St. *Peter*'s, he "was struck by the immediate Judgment of God: "And although, considering his Errors, he was "not very hasty in deposing himself, he called his "Brethren of *Cassinum*, and commanded them to "carry him thither, and to bury him, not like a "Pope, but an Abbot.

What a horrid Arraignment is here from a Bishop of the same Church, and present Witness of all the Proceedings at that Time in this great Affair! The Crimes charged upon this Supreme and Infallible Guide being no less than Perfidy and Treachery, in betraying the Church and Empire; standing excommunicate and unreconcil'd; a Violator

lator of the Decrees of the Holy Fathers; a Simoniac, in confederating with the Secular Power to promote himſelf to the Pontificate; a graceleſs Wretch, a Debauchee, and whom the Juſtice of God purſu'd, for he was poiſon'd in a Draught out of the Holy Chalice at his Abbey of *Caſſinum*. The Editors, and their Darling, *Hugh Flaviniac.* are utterly ſilent in the diſmal Character of this Pontiff by the Biſhop of *Lyons*; they ſpeaking in his Favour, and extolling his Power; nothing like throwing Dirt on him appearing in the whole Courſe of their Writing. And for what Reaſon *Labbé* ſhould introduce this Author painting Pope *Victor* in ſuch Colours, I cannot conceive: It's certain it cannot proceed from any Candour or Ingenuity in him, for he always ſhews himſelf a ſtrenuous Champion and Aſſerter of the Pontificate, as has been before obſerved. There is nothing in all this Epiſtle of the Biſhop of *Lyons* which ſeems to carry any Shadow or Colour of excuſing any Thing ſaid in Prejudice of this Pope, except it be the Concluſion; and I am apt to believe it was for the Sake of that, that *Labbé* has inſerted the whole Character of this Pope as black as it is: For that, ſays he, *though he was not over-haſty in depoſing himſelf, conſidering his Errors*, (which indeed were many and great) *he commanded that he ſhould be buried as an Abbot, not as a Pope:* And thus diveſting himſelf of the Papacy, he diſcharges himſelf of all his former Wickedneſs. Truly, (as I have before hinted) if I were to adviſe theſe Gentlemen, they ſhould either forbear to aſſert the Infallibility and Supremacy, or back their Aſſertions with better Arguments, and honeſter Authority; or at leaſt forbear introducing Proof, which utterly condemn their Practices.

The

The Four Books of Dialogues written by *Victor* III. concerning the Miracles of St. *Benedict*, and other Acts of the Monks of *Cassinum*, are one absurd, ridiculous, fabulous Legend, unbecoming the Majesty and Gravity of the Christian Religion; and, whatever they might be design'd for, are fit for nothing but to move Derision and Contempt; and which plainly shew Want of Judgment in the Writer, and Truth in the Matter of Fact asserted.

[1088.] Pope *Urban* II. call'd before *Otto*, succeeds *Victor* III. by his own particular Appointment a little before his Death; so that now the Manner of one Pope's naming his Successor is become a Custom: However, to keep up the Face of an Election, this Nomination of the preceding Pope is confirmed by the Cardinals hitherto. This is that *Otto* Bishop of *Ostia*, of whom *Hugo* Archbishop of *Lyons* in the last Pope's Reign so severely complains of, and inveighs against in his Epistle to the Countess *Mathilda*, for basely changing Party, and siding with Pope *Victor*; as has been spoken of before. And truly, if we consider the Abilities of the Man, and his Merits from the Papacy for its new set-up Sovereignty, Pope *Victor* could not have fix'd on a more proper Person; for he was well vers'd in Affairs of this Nature in the Time of *Gregory* VII. being in the Year 1083, sent Legate by him to the Emperor *Henry* IV. by whom he was taken up and confined. The Year following he proclaimed the Sentence of Excommunication against the Emperor and his Party throughout *Germany*. In the Year 1085, in the Council in *Quintilinburg* in *Germany*, *Otto* presided as Legate from *Gregory* VII. where he condemned *Wecilo* Archbishop of *Mentz* of Heresy, for holding as Doctrine, That a Prince excommunicated by the Pope had

not

not forfeited his Crown, though he was deprived of the Communion of the Church. So qualified a Perſon for the Intereſt of the Supremacy could not fail of Succeſs: Nor could Pope *Gregory* and *Victor* any where have found out one ſo fit to carry on what they had begun; eſpecially *Victor*, who beſides in a great Meaſure owed the Pontificate to *Otto*'s Treachery: For if *Otto*, then Biſhop of *Oſtia*, had continued firm to the Intereſt he was engaged in with the Archbiſhops of *Lyons*, *Aix*, *Luca*, and others, the Abbot of *Caſſinum* would have found more Difficulty in obtaining the Papacy, than in changing his Name to *Victor* III. He it was that gave the Sanction to this pious Act, by conſecrating the Abbot Pope; and therefore highly merited to ſucceed him: Which he accordingly did; and the Firſt Publick Act of his was the Confirmation of all the former Sentences againſt *Guibert* the Antipope, and the Emperor *Henry*, and his Party, in a Council at *Rome*, *A. D.* 1089.

In the Year 1090, he calls a Council at *Melfi* in *Apulia*, wherein Duke *Roger*, whom the Editors call a Vaſſal of the Holy *Roman* Church, is inveſted, taking an Oath of Fidelity to the Pope. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 478. In this Council likewiſe were conſtituted Sixteen Canons: The Firſt of which is a very honeſt and ſevere one againſt Simony. This indeed is an excellent Precaution in all Governors of the Church, where obſerv'd. No Councils have more frequently repeated this Canon againſt Simoniacks, and no Sort of People ever leſs obſerved it: And it is worth Obſervation, that thoſe Popes who have Simoniacally and Irregularly intruded into St. *Peter*'s Chair, have generally enter'd upon the Pontificate with this or ſome ſuch ſpecious Pretence of Sanctity. Inveſtitures from Lay-hands are ſtrictly forbid in this Council, as

alſo

alſo Concubinage of the Clergy, and ſeveral Things inſiſted on by former Popes; ſo that upon the Acceſſion of every Pope all old Quarrels are reviv'd that relate to the Grandeur of the *Roman* Pontiff; wherein they ſeldom fail of carrying their Point. The Sixteenth Canon of this Council is a moſt wholeſome Part of Eccleſiaſtick Diſcipline, than which no humane Means can contribute more to the preſent and future Quiet of a Penitent's Conſcience. This Canon is very poſitive againſt falſe Pennances; and leſt there ſhould be a Miſtake or Miſunderſtanding of the Terms, the Canon very aptly explains it ſelf, calling it falſe Pennance, when, neglecting many others, we repent of one Sin only; or when we repent of one, we continue in others. This is fairly ſtrengthen'd from St. *James*, c. 2. v. 10. *Whoſoever ſhall keep the whole Law, and yet faileth in one Point, is guilty of all.* How the Doctrine of Diſpenſations will agree with this, I leave the Reader to judge: Surely ſuch Reſerves in Sin vaſtly impede our Reconciliation with God; and he that repents of one or ſeveral Sins, and deliberately and connivingly continues in others, can be ſaid to perform but a lame Pennance: Such imperfect Reconciliation is next to none, for it excludes God's aſſiſting Grace, which ſhould ſtrengthen us in the Performance of that great Duty of Repentance, and would profanely proſtitute thoſe great Attributes of God, his Mercy, and Long-ſuffering, to ſome baſe humane End.

A. D. 1091, a Council was called at *Beneventum*, in which *Guibert* the Antipope and his Party are again excommunicated. In this Council, according to *Baronius*, Pope *Urban* beſtow'd a Pontifical Mitre on *Peter* the Abbot of *Cava*; the Uſe of which he declin'd, tho' the Pope inſiſted on it:

Which he is ſuppoſed to have done, ſays *Surius* in his Life, for no other Reaſon than to condemn, by this Example of Humility, the Arrogance and Pride of thoſe that undeſervedly extol themſelves, and aſſume the Honours of the Holy Church which they had no Right to.

A. D. 1092. The *Gallican* Church, in the Council of *Eſtampes*, rouz'd their ancient Genius and Courage; and, in the Struggle between them and *Ivo*, ſhew'd how unwilling they were to part with their Rights. The Cauſe of the Diſpute was this: *Godfrey* Biſhop of *Chartrain* having been depoſed by Pope *Urban* II. the Clergy and People of *Chartrain* choſe *Ivo* Abbot of *Belvac* in his Place, which Election the Pope likewiſe approved of. But *Richerius* Archbiſhop of *Sens*, and Metropolitan, refuſed to conſecrate *Ivo*; whereupon *Ivo* was under a Neceſſity of going to *Rome* for Conſecration, which he received from the Hands of Pope *Urban*, who wrote back to the People of *Chartrain*, and to Archbiſhop *Richerius*, in his Favour, threatning *Godfrey* and his Adherents with Excommunication if they did not deſiſt. Notwithſtanding theſe Menaces, *Richerius* refuſes to admit *Ivo*, diſperſing ſeveral Letters full of reproachful Calumny againſt him, and calling a Synod at *Eſtampes*, he, together with the Biſhops of *Paris*, *Meaulx*, and *Troyes*, calls *Ivo*'s Ordination in Queſtion, and accuſes him of Treaſon, for preſuming to receive Conſecration from the Apoſtolick See; nay they had proceeded to paſs Sentence of Depoſition againſt him, and Reſtitution of *Godfrey*, but for his timely Appeal to *Rome*. So that by this Time we may plainly ſee what Strength the Court of *Rome* had gained, that it could baffle the Attempts of the *Gallican* Biſhops to recover their Rights. That they have had Rights and Claims, and acted independently of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and

 often

often opposed the unjust Judgment and Determination of that Court, we have often before shewn, as in the Case of the two *Hincmars*, of *Rhemes* and *Laon*, and others. But by what Injustice or Force soever the Bishops of *Rome* had usurp'd this exorbitant Power over the rest of the *Western* Church, 'tis most certain the *Gallican* Church had Rights independant of that of *Rome*; which Usurpations Pope *Urban* II. as feloniously and falsly maintains as he and his Predecessors had gain'd. We have already shewn, that *Ivo*'s Appeal to *Rome* prevented his Deposition, so that *Richerius* and his Suffragans could not proceed. This Claim of Appealing to the See of *Rome*, Pope *Urban* justifies in his Twentieth Epistle to *Richerius*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 443. *from ancient and Divine Institution*, affirming, *not only Bishops and Primates, but even Patriarchs, to be subject to the Bishop of the Apostolick See; who knows, That all Appeals are made to him, and none from him; and that the sole Power of judging in the Church is his, but that he is subject to the Judgment of none.* I must beg his Infallibility's Pardon in this; for we have already shewn several Instances from the Editors and other of the Pontifical Authors, of Popes having been try'd by others, as *Marcellinus*, *&c.* of the Faithful forsaking the Communion of Heretical and Infidel Popes, as *Liberius*; and in many of the Decretal Epistles, the Forgeries that have been made to maintain this Doctrine of Appeals to *Rome*; and, what is most absurd, the very Forgeries, and own'd as such by *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, *Binius*, *Labbé*, *&c.* have often been produc'd in Favour of this Doctrine of Appeals. This must unavoidably give any one a just Prejudice to their pretended Universal Power, and an easy Judgment may determine safely against that Person who shall pretend to justify any Doctrine by Divine Institution, whose humane Authority

rity is prov'd to be a most infamous Forgery and Cheat.

A. D. 1093. the Emperor *Henry* is again excommunicated, and about this Time the Pope encourages *Conrade* to rebel against his Father the Emperor *Henry* IV. who banishes and outlaws his Son, and declares his Son *Henry* V. *Cæsar*. This Story of *Conrade*'s being incited to rebel, has a quite different Turn given it by the Editors in this Pope's Life, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 421. "The Pope again, say they, "excommunicated King *Henry*, because he had "imprison'd *Praxes* the Empress, his lawful Wife, "and offer'd her to be ravish'd by his Son and "others, and absolves *Conrade* the Son for this Rea-"son, because he would not obey his Father, to "commit Incest with his Mother." This is a Turn sufficient to strike any one with Horror; but the Editors had better have let this alone, unless they had shewn some Authority for what they had said, having no other than that of *Berthold*, a violent Rebel, and implacable Enemy of his Sovereign *Henry* IV. But of him more hereafter. Besides, as they suppose a Thing which was not done, (for *Conrade* did not ravish his Mother, though they say his Father commanded him) there was the less Cause for the Pope to encourage the Son to rise against the Father. But in this incredible Story of theirs against the Emperor, the Editors are guilty of a most inauspicious Blunder. It is to be observ'd, That the Editors pretend no King or Prince can be made Emperor but by the Pope; (forgetting the Electoral College instituted long ago for that Purpose) and therefore they frequently call *Henry Pseudo-Imperator*. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 402. And yet here, in this very Account, by which they would make *Henry* odious, they are guilty of a great Oversight; for they say, "The Pope ex-

" communicated King *Henry*, becauſe he had im-
" priſon'd *Praxes* the Empreſs, his lawful Wife."
Now I would fain know how *Praxes* could be Empreſs, when her Husband *Henry* was only King. But to ſhew a further Proof of theſe Inconſiſtencies, the running Title in *Labbé* calls him *Henricus* IV. *Imp.* all the Way.

In the Council of *Rhemes*, *A. D.* 1094. the Caſe of *Philip* King of *France* and *Bertrade* was only moved; but the ſame Year, at the Council of *Autun*, King *Philip*, the Emperor *Henry*, and *Guibert* the Antipope, with ſeveral Simoniacks and Incontinents, were excommunicated. But in the Year following, in the Councils of *Placentia* and *Clermont*, in which Pope *Urban* ſat in Perſon, the Affair of King *Philip*'s was quite determined, and he and his inceſtuous Wife excommunicated. As for *Philip*, it's beyond Diſpute he was a moſt notorious Offender, and that no Proceſs or Eccleſiaſtical Cenſure could be too ſevere; for his Crimes were Adultery and Inceſt in a very high Degree. He put away his lawful Wife *Berta*, and took *Bertrade*, the Daughter of *Simeon de Monte-fort*, and Wife of his near Kinſman *Fulco* Count of *Anjou*. Nor was he content with this, but he afterwards married her, and had her anointed Queen of *France*. Theſe are Crimes of a deep Die, ſuch as cannot be ſufficiently aggravated, nor eaſily atton'd for; but when the Editors mention any Thing of the Emperor *Henry* IV. from their Oracle *Berthold*, I muſt very often ſuſpend my Belief: For, in the firſt Place, *Berthold* was very early engaged in the Quarrel between *Gregory* VII. and the Emperor, to whom he was an implacable and dangerous Enemy, not only drawing his Pen, but his Sword, (tho' a Prieſt) againſt his lawful Sovereign. Pope *Gregory*, obſerving his Malice to his Prince, adapts him to Buſineſs

fineſs ſuitable to his Genius; for he makes it as a Part of his Province, to receive into the Boſom of the Church all ſuch as ſhould revolt from *Cæſar* to the Pope: In which he did the Pope great Service, and no leſs Damage to his Maſter. In his Hiſtory, he treats the Emperor with much ill Manners, aſperſing him with Lies, incredible Calumnies, and all the immodeſt Expreſſions of a prejudic'd Mind, very diſagreeable and unentertaining to a modeſt Reader, that is ſearching for Truth. This Author is very much made uſe of by the Editors for the Time he writes, for he is an excellent Champion for the Pontificate, being very good at gloſſing over and defending any Thing that he thinks carries not a ſmooth Face for the Honour of it. An Inſtance of which we have in his Account of the Council of *Placentia*, upon which the Editors chiefly depend. " The Pope gaining Ground almoſt eve-
" ry where, calls a Council in the City of *Placen-*
" *tia*, in the midſt of the Schiſmaticks; to which
" were ſummon'd the Biſhops of *Italy*, *Burgundy*,
" *France*, *&c.* ſo that the Multitude of all Sorts
" which met here was ſo vaſt, that no one Church
" in the City could contain them; whereupon the
" Pope was forc'd to hold the Council in the open
" Field. But leſt this ſhould look irregular and mobbiſh, he gives it a ſmooth Turn, by ſaying,
" He did not this without the Authority of a good
" Example, for *Moſes*, the firſt Lawgiver, at the
" Command of God, taught the People their Du-
" ty in the Fields." This muſt certainly be granted *Berthold*, for I do not ſee where elſe but in the Fields *Moſes* could teach the People, who lived in nothing but Tents in the open Air. But he goes on, and ſays, " That our bleſſed Lord did not
" preach the Goſpel to his Diſciples in Houſes, but
" in the Mountain, and in the Fields." Here the

Comparison holds less than in the former Example. There is a vast Difference between an Act of Necessity, and an Act of Choice: Our Saviour indeed was often interrupted in the Temple and Synagogues, but yet we find he often taught in those Places; but when he taught in the Fields or Mountains, or on Shipboard, it was an Act of Necessity, which was never allow'd to be brought into a Precedent. Again he goes on, and says, "Sometimes likewise we celebrate Mass justifiably enough out of the Church, in case of Necessity, tho' we know there are Churches peculiarly appropriated to that Office." *Berthold*, I doubt, was no good Canonist, else he might have consider'd, that the Case of Necessity he mentions here is by the Canon called Sickness, when the Penitent cannot go to the Church; otherwise, there are many Canons which positively forbid the Celebration of Mass out of the Church.

In the Pontificate of Pope *Urban* II. began the Orders of *Carthusians*, *Cistersians*, *Shady Vally*, and *Antonians*: and indeed this Century, from the Beginning, is very remarkable for the Encrease and Power of Monkery in general. This I take to be chiefly encourag'd by the several Popes that had been Abbots; who being promoted to the highest Pitch of Honour in the Church, had still a great Regard to the Orders they had been of, not only adding to the Foundation several Immunities and Gifts, but either instituting or confirming new ones. This gave them a mighty Opportunity of enlarging their Societies and Incomes, especially in those Countries where the Sovereigns had submitted to the Papal Yoke. A great Instance of which we have in our King *Edgar*, who in the Year 960, or thereabout, founded and endowed 47 Monasteries for Men and Women, promising to make them 50.

He

He enlarg'd the Privileges of the Monasteries of *Glastenbury* and *Malmsbury*, and did so many Things in Favour of the Monks, that the Secular Clergy were wholly eclips'd by their growing Greatness, which they miserably labour'd under at last; for having gotten the best and greatest Part of the Churches into their Hands, they grew luxurious and proud, which soon provok'd the Secular Power to attempt a Reformation, which ended in a most inexcusable and abominable Sacrilege.

But it is no Wonder that any Prince in the Interest of the Pontificate should do so, considering what the Popes themselves had done in several Councils in Favour of the Monks. Pope *Urban*, towards the End of this Century, declares himself amply in their Interest; for at the Council of *Nismes*, *A. D.* 1096. in which he presided, there are several Canons highly in Favour of the Monks. The First breaks the Way towards the ridding them of the Episcopal Jurisdiction; for in any Church which belongs to a Monastery, the Bishop of the Diocess shall not collate any Priest to it without the Consent of the Abbot. Here is a plain Encroachment on the Episcopal Power. The Second Canon is a direct Panegyrick on the Monastick State, making the Efficacy of the Priestly Office in them to be most excellent, calling them Angels, and that as they are more sublime by their Retreat from the World, they are so much the more excellent. The Third Canon is a partial, ungentile, and unchristian Determination in Behalf of the Monks, making their Ministry preferable to that of Secular Priests. "They must needs, says the Canon, be "more sollicitous to pray for the Sins of Men, and "be more prevalent for their Pardon, who have "abandon'd the World, than Secular Priests, who "live in it." It may be thought a great Presum-

ption for a private Person to question the Power of a Synod, and the Truth of its Decrees: But when Synods decree Things in themselves unreasonable, and contrary to the express Command of God; his Son our Saviour, and his Apostles, I think it no Breach of good Manners, or of Christianity, to question the Authority of such a Synod. How can any Man call himself infallible, or with what Face can any Number of Men conjunctly so far depreciate an Order of God's own instituting, as to prefer an Order of humane Institution to it! If a Man has a Mind to seclude himself from the World, it is either to gratify some private Humour, or his natural Inclination; at the best, he can but be said to retire from the World in order to enjoy a more strict Communion with God. This is well, I grant; yet this is still but a private Good, affecting none but himself. Nor can he be said to affect any one with his Example, for that cannot improve the World, nor illustrate or adorn his Station, whilst it is private. It is like a Miser's Diamond, which shines indeed, but is lock'd up in the Dark, and is to the World as useless as a Candle set under a Bushel. It is contrary to the express Command of our Saviour, *Let the Lights shine before Men*, (to which he subjoins the Reason, *That they may see your good Works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven.* And, to condemn the lazy useless Life of all who neglect Opportunities of Improvement, he is at the Expence of a Parable, and pronounces a severe and heavy Sentence against the slothful Servant that hid his Talent. Men, to whom God has given great Abilities, should produce their Talents, and not enclose themselves and their more useful Capacities within the melancholy Circle of Retirement. *No Man*, saith St. *Paul*, *lives to himself. Rom.* 14. 7. And *Cicero* sayes, *No Man is born for himself.* Therefore

fore the greater our Endowments are, the more communicative ought we to be. All Benefits are so intended by the grand Donor of them, and we have a positive Command from our Blessed Lord to imitate the Author of them: *Be ye merciful, as your Heavenly Father also is merciful. Luke* 6. 36. To imitate God in all Things, is impossible; to imitate him in some Things, is Presumption; but in Acts of Goodness he strictly obliges us: And wherein do or can we more exactly copy after the glorious Original of Mercy, than in instructing the Ignorant, feeding and refreshing their hungry and thirsty Souls by the Communication of those Divine Graces and Benefits God has bestowed on us. But this cannot be said to be done by an unactive Recluse, whose Retirement takes off from his Usefulness, and his Example is lost to the World. Such a Retreat destroys the End of Community, which is one great Intent of Man's Creation; it tends to unpeopling the World; would make it a Desart; nay, soon dissolve it. He that is thus inclin'd, (I may say, fond of himself) deserves no other Remembrance than a *Hic situs*, for he is dead and buried while he lives. But after all the imaginary Beauties of this fanciful Retirement, as wicked as the World is, the Recluse will have a Share in the Management of it; and there are no Charms in this holy Recess Proof against Secular Promotion: Witness the Prevarication of Pope *Victor* III. who could find no Argument in his Cell, after a Twelve-months Deliberation, strong enough to encounter worldly Ambition. I beg Pardon for this Digression, and return.

This Council of *Nismes* was the First publick Declaration in that Way in Favour of the Monastick State; which, how far it hath gain'd Ground, all

all Monasteries and Colleges since founded and endowed but too plainly demonstrate.

[1099.] The Manner of a Pope's naming his Successor is now pass'd into a secure Custom; for it is the Third Time repeated in Pope *Paschal* II. and the Way of changing their Names is as fashionably preserved as any other Innovation; for this Pope's Name was *Rainer*, Abbot of the Monastry of St. *Laurence* and St. *Stephen*, whom, by the Advice and Perswasion of dying Pope *Urban*, the Clergy and People of *Rome* chose Pope, as much against his Will, I suppose, as any of his Predecessors. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 620. This Unwillingness to accept the Pontificate, which the Editors so frequently make Use of in the Beginning of most of the Popes Lives, is so unnecessary a Piece of Hypocrisy and Cant, that no Body can be impos'd upon by it, especially considering that this Holy Rape from their Monastick Retirement is what they have most affectionately courted, and too many of them have made Use of Means very unjustifiable, either in a Civil or Ecclesiastick Sense, to obtain what they have so seemingly and self-denyingly pretended to decline, and yet accept. This savours much of Ambition, which can transform it self into any Shape to accomplish its End.

Pope *Paschal*'s Abilities were undoubtedly well known to his Predecessor *Urban*, who had never recommended him to the Chair, if he had not expected great Things from him in Favour of the Pontificate against the *Regale*; which indeed at that Time lay but in a gasping Condition, and in vain struggling with insuperable Pangs. This Pope *Paschal* II prosecuted with as much Heat as any before him; for to make sure Work he tore up the Cause by the very Root in the Death of the Emperor *Henry* IV. whom he so closely and eagerly pursu'd, that he never quitted him till he

quitted

quitted the World. But these and many other Occurrences during this Pontificate we will relate in Order.

He was by the Name of *Rainer* bred a Monk in the Abbey of *Chiny*, and afterwards created Cardinal-Priest by Pope *Gregory* VII. Being thus early promoted, he, no doubt, inclined to pursue his own ambitious Ends, in prosecuting the Interest of the Papacy; and therefore was the fittest and most likely Pope to secure what had thus prosperously (though surreptitiously) succeeded. In the Beginning of his Pontificate, *Guibert* the Antipope, who had given much Disturbance to the *Roman* See, by holding up a Schism of One and twenty Years, dies in the Castle of St. *Angelo*. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 620. The Inquietude which threaten'd the Church, by the Obtrusion of Three Pseudopopes successively, was soon dissipated by the powerful Influence and Interest of Pope *Paschal*; who, seeing all Things in a profound Tranquillity at *Rome*, began to cast about with himself how to carry on the Projects which his Three Predecessors had so successfully to his Reign maintained.

In the Council of *Poictou*, *A. D.* 1100, there are some Passages very remarkable, and especially as coming from *Hugo Flaviniac.* the great Favorite of the Editors. In this Council there were many Things transacted; but the Two chief Causes were that of *Norigand* Bishop of *Edua*, for Simony; and that of *Philip* King of *France*, in the Case of *Bertrade*, whom he had recall'd. The Case of *Norigand* had been first heard the *October* before, in the Council of *Valence* in *Dauphiny*, where he was suspended *ab Officio*; and here in this Council of *Poictou* he was deprived of his Orders. But in the Relation of this, the Editors, out of their admired *Hugo Flaviniac. Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 720. make a Discovery

covery of ſome Thing, in the Acts of this Council, very inconſiſtent with their then claim'd Supremacy. The Council, and the Pope's Legates, *John* and *Benedict*, could not agree. "The Controverſy (ſay the Editors) continues, and the "Anſwers of the Cardinals, (*viz.* the Legates) "are rejected by the whole Council, inſiſting on "the Rights of the *Gallican* Church, in nothing "allowing their Authority to be infring'd, nor "conſenting to any Appeals." So that though the Pope preſided in this Council, and was repreſented in it by Two Legates; yet the *Gallican* Church inſiſted ſo much on her Right, that ſhe would not admit of the Arbitrary Supremacy the See of *Rome* had pretended to claim over the Weſtern Church. Had other Churches in *Europe*, as Part of the Catholick Church, inſiſted on their Rights with the ſame Courage the *Gallican* Church did, the See of *Rome* had not been *Univerſal*, as ſome are pleas'd to call it now. And it is much to be feared, that the Deluge of Blood which hath for many Years overflow'd the Chriſtian World, owes its Source to nothing ſo much as the unnatural Ambition and greedy Encroachment of the Court of *Rome*.

The Canons which were made in this Council of *Poictou* are very much in Favour of the Regular Clergy, the Monaſtick State prevailing, and getting Ground in moſt Parts: Nor was it likely to do otherwiſe, when the Biſhops of *Rome*, who for ſome Years about this Time had been Regulars, ſo affectionately eſpouſed their Intereſt. This enlarged their Privileges and Incomes; and from being made equal with the Secular Clergy, as in the Tenth Canon of this Council, where they are allow'd the ſame Privileges of Baptizing, Preaching, Impoſing Pennance, and Burying, they ſoon

became

became superior. And whereas these Privileges just mentioned, of Baptizing, *&c.* were to be performed but with the Command or Licence of the Bishop of the Diocese, they at last grew so arrogant, that they threw off all Subjection to their Diocesan, and by a lawless Liberty acted in all Dioceses as if they were in their own. This was a fatal Blow, not only to Episcopacy, but to Discipline in general; for being supported by the Bishop of *Rome*, they denied Obedience to any else: And for Canonical Censures, they were above the Reach of them, and would submit to none but what squar'd with their Interest and Conveniency.

Conrad Abbot of *Ursperg*, another of the Editors Creatures, is guilty of a very great Oversight relating to the *Roman* Supremacy; for in the First *Lateran* Council of this Century, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 727. *Ursperg, ad An.* 1102, *p.* 184. he tells us, "That "the Emperor *Henry*, after a Conference with the "Princes of *Germany*, determin'd to go to *Rome*, "and to call a General Council there about the "Calends of *February*, that not so much his Cause, "as that of the Apostolick Lord, being canonically "argued, a Catholick Union might be confirmed "between the Crown and the Priesthood, which "had for so many Years been divided." Here it is plain, if *Conrad* relates Truth, that the Emperor had Power of calling a General Council; nay, and upon the Account of determining a Controversy of a long Continuance between no less Persons than the Pope and himself, and about establishing a general Union between Church and State. But the Editors perhaps may say, in Defence of their Creature, that this never arriv'd to Fact, and therefore is no Testimony: But I must take Leave to say, that if there had been no such Power in the Emperor, I can scarce perswade my self, or any

one

one else, that the Historian, and a Friend of the Pontificate too, would have inserted a Passage that was to have come to pass if both Parties had agreed. But the same Historian goes on, and says: "Yet "it is certain, he (*i. e.* the Emperor) neither came "according to his Appointment, nor sent any "Message, acknowledging his Submission to the "Apostolick Dignity." *Ibid.* This is very preposterous and inconsistent, that this Author should first invest the Emperor with a Power of calling a General Council, and afterwards in the same Paragraph expect or imply, that this Power that could do so should pay Subjection to one inferior to him in Temporals! But he goes on with this in the same Page, *ibid.* and seems to confirm rather than enervate the Imperial Power; for says he, "Nor is it to be forgotten, that he did not at-"tempt to put another Pope over his Head.

[*A. D.* 1104.] A Council was held at *Fussela* in *Spain*, in the Presence of King *Alphonsus* VI. and in which *Richard* the Pope's Legate presided. At this Time, and in this Part of the Western Church, the Celibacy of the Clergy was so little understood or observed, that, notwithstanding the pressing Instances of the *Legate* to carry his Point, he could not prevail. This Council is not taken Notice of by the Editors, but may be found among the *Spanish* Councils, *T.* 3. *p.* 317. by *Sandovalius*.

The same Year was held the Second Lateran Council of this Century: In which Pope *Paschal* excommunicates all the Favourers of Lay-Investitures in *England*, especially the Councellors of the King, who put him upon seizing them; and not only the Investers, but the Persons invested, are deprived of the Communion of the Church. This Feud continued till the Year 1107, when in the Second Council of *London*, the Pope, by the Management

ment of his faithful Favourite *Anselm*, gain'd a Confirmation of what he had long labour'd to settle in *England*; the King consenting, that Investitures should not be dispos'd of by the Laity.

The Emperor *Henry* IV. had with various Success struggled with several Popes about the Right of Investitures, and several other Things. And indeed he had his Hands full enough, to engage the most formidable Champions of the Pontificate in the Person of *Gregory* VII. *Victor* III. *Urban* II. and *Paschal* II. that ever possess'd St. *Peter's* Chair. But at last, after a long and troublesome Reign, an unnatural Rebellion of the Son against the Father, and the Subjects against their Prince, soon put an End to these Animosities. *Cabbasutius*, in his *Notit. Eccles. p.* 401. who gleans from *Berthold*, *Otho*, *Frisingens.* and *Marianus Scotus*, does not leave Pope *Paschal* altogether clear of Suspicion of being concerned in these Commotions against the Emperor, for he says, Sect. 2. "That *Henry* V. "shew'd a great Veneration and Respect to the "*Roman* See, and that when all *Germany* was in "Rebellion against his Father, he join'd with "them in Arms against him." Now with what Face a Prince could pretend to offer any Respect or Veneration to his Spiritual Father, when he was in open Rebellion against his Natural Father; or with what Conscience a Spiritual Father could receive a Son rebelling against his Natural Father, and in so doing violating the first and greatest Command of the Second Table, is very plain to any Judgment. It had been a greater Addition to the Character of the First Bishop to have perswaded the Son and his rebellious Companions to return to their Duty, than to encourage them in their detestable, damnable Practices; which it is certain he did; for in the Year 1105, at the Council of

Mentz, he confirmed it to the World, by joining with the Bishops and Princes of *Germany* in the Deposing of *Henry* the Father. *Conrad* Abbot of *Ursperg* says, the Son was perswaded by some Bishops to renounce his Allegiance to his Father, (a Practice too often and fatally since imitated!) but *Cabbasutius*, *ibid.* speaks plainer, and says, "*Henry* "*Senior* being thus deserted and hated of all, open- "ly abdicates himself of the Empire, and resigns "the Regalia into the Hands of his Son, whom "the People had chosen, and the Legates of the "Apostolick See had confirm'd. But because this "was not an Act of Choice, but of Necessity, he "fled to *Liege*, where being kindly received, "he wrote Letters to the King of the *Celtæ*, set- "ting forth the Hardship of his Case, and com- "plaining of his ungrateful and rebellious Son, and "Pope *Paschal*, whom he calls Incendiary of the "most unjust War, and Trumpeter of Rebellion." This Wants no Explanation, nor can any cover or excuse this wicked Fact. It is plain here was a most unnatural Rebellion, and no less an Abetter and Fomenter of it than the Bishop of the First See.

Henry IV. being thus strip'd of the Imperial Dignity, and all Things becoming his Character, can no longer bear up against the Fury of his Enemies, but overwhelm'd with Grief and Misfortunes, pays the last Debt to Nature at *Liege*. Death, one would naturally think, should put an End to all Differences; but Malice will survive, for Pope *Paschal* is resolv'd to allow *Henry*'s Body as little rest in the Grave, as it had above Ground. Accordingly the Schismatical Bishop of *Liege* (as *Cabbasutius* calls him) could not be restor'd to the Communion of the Church, till he had order'd *Henry*'s Body to be digg'd up, and removed to some prophane Place;

for this Bishop had commanded the Body to be privately buried, and without Ceremony, in a certain Monastery, from whence it was moved to *Spires*, where being put up in a Stone-Coffin, it was deposited in unconsecrated Ground. This likewise was the Fate of *Guibert* Archbishop of *Ravenna*, and Antipope, who Five Years after his Death was, by Order of the Council of *Mentz*, digg'd up and burn'd: In which Council it was likewise decreed, that all Bishops of the Emperor *Henry*'s Party who were alive should be depos'd; and those that were dead should be digg'd up and burn'd. *Labb. T.* 10 *p.* 620.

I ask the Reader's Pardon for interrupting the Order of Time, but the Series of History requires it, and therefore I shall proceed to the rest of what pass'd between the two *Henries* and Pope *Paschal* II. which other interfering Matter would disjoint.

Henry V. having, *A. D.* 1106. sent a most splendid Embassy to the Pope, in which he disclaim'd all Title and Pretence to the Investiture of any Holy Dignities, and promis'd eternal Obedience and Fidelity to the Supream See, desires to be consecrated Emperor by him. Which being agreed upon, he enters *Italy* with a vast Army, and *A. D.* 1111, on the 12th of *February*, he is met without the City by the Nobility and People, at the Gates by the Clergy, and at St. *Peter*'s by Pope *Paschal*, whose Feet *Henry* having first kiss'd, they mutually embrac'd, and enter'd the Church together. Thus to outward Appearance Things went swimmingly; but *Henry* was no more sincere at this Time, than his Holiness was afterwards; for when the Pope demanded of him to recognize his former Promises of Duty and Fidelity to the Supream See, and especially that of restoring the Investitures of Ecclesiastick Benefices to the Church, he not only re-

 fused

fused to perform any of these, but secures the Pope, denying to crown him, and several Cardinals, under a strong Guard in his Camp, where he detain'd them One and sixty Days, not sparing for Threats and other Ways to humble his Supremacy; which did not fail of their desired Effect; for *Cabbalutius*, *p.* 402. *col.* 1. says, The Calamities of his Fellow-Sufferers, the Danger the City was in by *Henry*'s Army, the Schism which would inevitably follow, and the Importunity of his Friends, did at last prevail with the good Man to take an Oath never to excommunicate *Henry*, and that he would allow of all Investitures granted by him; and this the other Bishops and Cardinals that were detain'd with him were oblig'd to swear. In fine, an Instrument is extorted from Pope *Paschal* under his Hand and Seal, allowing *Henry* to invest all Bishops and Abbots, elect with the Ring and Staff, and that before their Consecration, no other previous Investiture than that of the King's should be requir'd. Hereupon the Captives are enlarg'd, and *Henry* is crowned and anointed Emperor by Pope *Paschal* II. The forementioned Arguments for doing these ill Things, *viz.* The Danger and Importunity of Friends, and the City, together with the threatning Schism, were Calamities at a Distance, and only in *posse*, not in *esse*; and so long a good Man may hope for an intervening Providence, to avert those threatning Mischiefs; but suppose or admit the worst actually to happen, his Infallibility was much out of the Way to make Necessity an Argument for justifying an ill Action, since the Scripture has given us a short but golden Rule, *Not to do Evil, that Good may come of it.* *Henry* indeed did play the Part of a wicked Man, in treacherously decoying the Infallible Judge into such a difficult Dilemma, and extorting such Concessions from him;

him; but his Infallibility is resolved to let him know, he can resent like other Mortals; "For as "soon as the Emperor had withdrawn his Army, "and that the Pope was retired into *Campania*, "the Bishops and Cardinals meeting at *Rome*, con-"firm'd all the Decrees made by *Gregory* VII. and "*Urban* II. against Lay-Investitures, decreeing "likewise at the same Time, that nothing on the "contrary extorted from Pope *Paschal* should be of "any Force." *Lab. ibid.* who cites *Otho Frisingens. Petrus Diaconus*, and others. This would be a severe Reflection on the Infallibility, but that the Confession of Pope *Paschal* in the Fifth *Lateran* Council, *viz. A. D.* 1116. takes it off, shewing in what Capacity he took the Oath to the Emperor. "After the Lord had done what he pleased with his "Servant, and had deliver'd me and the *Roman* "People into the Hands of the King, Rapine, "Fire, and Sword raged every where. Being de-"sirous therefore to avert these Mischiefs from the "Church and People of God, I did what I did; "and what I did was for the Freedom of the Peo-"ple of God. But I did it as a Man, who am "but Dust and Ashes. I confess I have done "wickedly; wherefore I desire you all to pray to "God to pardon me. But that wicked Writing "(*i. e. the Instrument he sign'd*) which was done in "Camp, I condemn to a perpetual Anathema, that "it may hereafter be of no Force; and in this I "desire you all to join with me." Thus the Editors, out of *Conrad* of *Ursperg*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 807. But that which follows is so ridiculous and absurd, that I cannot imagine for what End *Conrad* wrote it, or the Editors cite it. After the Pope had made this Confession in the Council, one *Bruno*, a Bishop, stands up, and says, "Let us thank God, who "have heard our Lord Pope *Paschal*, who presides

"over this Council, with his own Mouth con-
"demning that Privilege which contain'd Wicked-
"ness and Heresy. And then in a bantering Man-
"ner adds, If that Privilege contained Heresy, he
"that made it was an Heretick." The very Manner of the Expression shews it to be an intended Jest and Banter upon the Pope's Weakness; which nothing could come up to or exceed, but the Defence of *Cajetan*, a Bishop likewise in this Council, who looking scornfully upon *Bruno*, said, "Do you in Council, and in the Hearing of us "all, call the *Roman* Pontiff Heretick? The Wri-"ting indeed which he sign'd was an ill Thing, "but it was not Heresy." And another, to mend "the Matter, stands up and says, "Nay, it ought "not so much as to be called Evil, because, if to "free the People of God be a good Thing, what "the Pope did was good." This Person is not named by *Conrad*, but whatever he was in other Respects, I believe the Reader will join with me in this, that he had but a very slender Share of Skill in Logick. But he goes on: "To deliver the Peo-"ple of God is good by the Authority of the Gos-"pel, in which we are commanded to lay down "our Lives for our Brethren." 'Tis granted, but this is not to be done by Lying and Perjury. But to make an End, "The Pope's Patience began to "be rouz'd at the horrible Name of Heresy, and "beckoning with his Hand for Silence, says, Hear "me, Brethren, this Church never had any Here-"ticks; for here all Heresies are quash'd: Here "the *Arian* Heresy, which for Three hundred "Years troubled the World, was brought to an "End." Truly his Holiness was but indifferently skill'd in Story; for, as has been already said, the Bishops of *Rome* had so little Concern in that Matter, that it is not known yet in what Pope's Reign

the

the First *Nicene* Council was held, which took the greatest Cognizance of that Heresy. But as to his saying, *That the Church of* Rome *never had any Heresy*, he is as much or more out than before; their Church could not have Hereticks without Heresy; and for *Hereticks*, Infidels, Apostates, Simoniacks, *&c.* the Catalogue of Popes, in Proportion to the Number, may vie with the worst Sort of Men, since God bless'd the World with the Christian Religion. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 807, 808. There is one remarkable Passage at the pretended Reconciliation between the Emperor *Henry* V. and the Pope, which I have omitted in its proper Place; *viz.* That at the Celebration of Mass, the Pope, in Confirmation of the Peace, gave the Emperor the Lord's Body, using these Words: My Lord the Emperor, in Confirmation of the Peace between you and me, I give you the Body of our Lord, who was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and suffer'd on the Cross for us." There could not be a more solemn Recognition of God than in this Manner; and yet there was no Reality on either Side: For it is plain that the Emperor did not mean sincerely towards the Pope; and on the other Hand, it's as certain that the Pope meant as fallaciously as the Emperor; for the foresaid Calamities of his Fellow-Sufferers, the Danger of the City, the Schism, and the Importunity of Friends, so prevailed with the good Pope, that he took an Oath he never intended to keep. But the Editors, tho' they insert this Story of the Pope's giving the Eucharist to the Emperor upon this Sham-Reconciliation; yet it looking somewhat ludicrously on the Pope's Side, find it necessary to invalidate it, and therefore call *Sigebert*, who is the Author, a Favourer of Schismatick Emperors. But as to *Sigebert*, his Character is equally good with theirs, he was a Monk, and

cotemporary with the great Actors in these Affairs He took the Part indeed of the two *Henries* against Pope *Gregory* VII. and his two Successors, *Urban* and *Paschal*, against whose Decrees he was a strenuous Opponent; for which Cause *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, *&c.* are not sparing of Calumny. However their Malice cannot affect his Worth, and his Writings, *viz. Chronicon, ab An.* 381, *ad An.* 1112. his Book, *De Scriptoribus Eccles. &c.* make his Abilities very eminently appear to the World. But to return.

The Pope having confess'd and repented of his Failings, and recall'd the Concessions he had made about Investitures to the Emperor, *&c.* the Emperor pursues the perfidious Pope, and in the Year 1117, drives him out of *Rome*; but he getting together a numerous Army of *Normans*, and having been very successful in *Campania*, thought himself so secure of Victory, that he proudly and disdainfully refused Absolution to the Emperor, who in a most suppliant Manner requested it. The 28th of *January*, 1118. Pope *Paschal* was forc'd to resign the Prosecution of his Quarrel to his Successor, who manag'd it with quite different Success.

Among the Epistles of this Pope, there is one, *viz.* the 27th, to the Canons of *Aost*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 653 which the Editors themselves mark for a Forgery, and say, That *Baronius*, *ad An.* 1112. *n.* 25. looks upon it as a Fiction forg'd by *Conrad* Canon of *Aost*. Now, as this Epistle is by them acknowledg'd to be fictitious, any reasonable Person would think it not for the Reputation of the Editors, or the Interest of their Cause, to insert notorious Falsities, and such as themselves cannot but own to be so. But consider, Forgeries, as we have already plainly made appear, were always invented to serve

ſerve ſome End; and this Epiſtle does not want that, for it ſpeaks very largely of the Extent of Power, and of Appeals to the Biſhop of *Rome*.

Pope *Paſchal* II. and his two great Predeceſſors *Gregory* VII. and *Urban* II. having wreſted ſo much Power out of the Hands of the Emperor and other Temporal Princes, ſoon falls upon a proper Method to fix this Power; therefore when any one was choſen Biſhop or Archbiſhop, the Apoſtolick See demanded an Oath of Fidelity and Obedience from them before they delivered them the Pall. This is very expreſs from the two Epiſtles of Pope *Paſchal* II. to the Archbiſhop of *Palermo*, and *N.* Archbiſhop of *Poland*. The Argument in both which is the ſame, and the Reſult of them both amounts to this, " That ſince they received the Enſigns of " their Dignity from the Apoſtolick See, which " were taken, as it were, from the very Hand " of St. *Peter*, it was but reaſonable that they ſhould " pay Signs of due Subjection to the Apoſtolick " See, *&c. Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 627, 628. Theſe Epiſtles are of early Date in this Pope's Pontificate, being the Fifth and Sixth in Number; which ſhews what Care he took to ſecure what his Predeceſſors had gain'd from the Temporal Prince. And his Method of diminiſhing the Imperial Majeſty, and advancing his own, cannot be better exemplified than in that cunning Inſinuation of his in his Epiſtles; the Second, Fourth, Tenth, and ſo on to the Number of at leaſt Thirty, bearing Date according to the Year of his Pontificate, and not of the Emperor, which formerly was the Cuſtom: By theſe Means extenuating the Name and Power together of the Imperial Dignity, to encroach upon which they never neglected an Opportunity.

A. D. 1106. Pope *Paschal* II. held a Council at *Guastalla* in *Lombardy*, in which the chief Care of the Pope was to secure so dangerous a Rival as the Metropolis of *Ravenna* had been to the See of *Rome*, from any future Attempts. This the Pope effectually accomplish'd in this Synod, by divesting that Metropolis of all *Emilia*, with the Cities thereunto belonging, *viz. Placentia, Parma, Rhegium, Mutina*, and *Bononia*, which were never more to pay any Obedience or Subjection to the Church of *Ravenna*. The MS. of *Cencius Camerarius*, in the *Vatican*, speaks the Reason of this very plainly. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 748. "This Metropolis, for nigh an "hundred Years, had been a proud Rival of "the Apostolick See; for it had not only usurp'd "several of its Estates, but *Guibert*, the late Me-"tropolitan of it, had invaded the very *Roman* "Church." Here was indeed the true Cause of the Grievance, and which Pope *Paschal* II. was resolv'd to eradicate, by disabling the Church of *Ravenna* from ever contending with that of *Rome*, in divesting her of so many Cities. The Bishops of *Rome* indeed had too successfully encroach'd upon several Churches, and often met with strong Opposition from several in Defence of their Rights, as has been already noted, particularly from *Hincmar* Archbishop of *Rhemes*, and other Parts of the *Gallican* Church, who were tenacious of their Rights, till Power prevailing, they were compell'd to Submission, which cannot be call'd a canonical Proceeding. These have been the Methods of the Bishops of *Rome* advancing the Greatness of that See to what it now is; but it may be observ'd, that the same Exorbitances and Encroachments have divested her of several powerful and wealthy Kingdoms, who could no longer bear her insufferable Pride and Insults. For who can look upon

those

those diabolical Practices of raising unnatural Commotions in Kingdoms and Empires, absolving Subjects from their Allegiance to their lawful Princes, encouraging Children to rebel against and depose their Parents, and filling the Christian World with Blood and Confusion, and not be struck with Horror and Amazement? These Methods must needs create a just Jealousy in all Churches and States; for that Body of People, whether Ecclesiastick or Civil, whose Rights are invaded, must be allowed to be in Danger; and when they are once depriv'd of them, I cannot think them otherwise than in a State of Slavery. For this Reason the *Gallican* Church hath so often struggled with that of *Rome*, and was once in a fair Way of bringing the Bishop of *Rome* to better Terms, had he not betaken himself to the old Method of raising Rebellions, setting Children against their Parents, and Subjects against their Sovereigns. Another Instance of a loyal Struggle in the *Gallican* Church was at the Council of *Ansa*, about the Business of Lay-Investitures. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 786, *&c.* And *Cossart*, in his Premonition to this Council, speaks very honestly. "As to what concerns this Council, says he, we "know that there was such a Council held, and "that the Bishops of the Province of *Sens* were "called to it, but refused to obey. However the "Council was held, and the Archbishop and Bishops "of *Sens*, in a synodical Epistle, gave Reasons for their "absenting." To which *John* Archbishop of *Lyons* writes an Answer. They are both valuable Monuments of Antiquity; and tho' the Archbishop of *Lions* seems to be of the Opinion of the Court of *Rome*; yet there appears in both a Strain of neat Reasoning, and Abundance of good Manners.

A. D.

A. D. 1115. A Council was held ſomewhere in *Syria*, ſome think in *Jeruſalem*, in the Caſe of *Arnulph* Patriarch thereof. If the Editors had deſign'd to throw a Scandal on Pope *Paſchal* II. they could not have pitch'd upon a more infamous Story. Let the Reader take it as they relate it from *Will. Tyrius l.* 11. *Belli Sacri, c.* 26. "At that Time the Pope "being inform'd of the enormous Converſation "of *Arnulph* Patriarch of *Jeruſalem*, he ſent the "Biſhop of *Orange*, a venerable Man, and con-"ſpicuous for his religious Life, as Legate into "thoſe Parts of *Syria*, who calling together a "Council of all the Biſhops of that Kingdom, "*Arnulph* was brought before them; where, ac-"cording to his Deſerts, he was by the Pontifi-"cal Authority deprived of his Pontifical Office. "But *Arnulph*, depending on his own Cunning, "by which he had cheated ſo many, takes Ship-"ping, and haſtens to *Rome*, where, with fair "Words and large Preſents, he ſo blinded the "Eyes of the Pope, [good Man!] and the whole "Church, that he return'd to his See in Triumph." According to this Account of *Tyrius*, the Scandal lies upon both Capacities; for ſometimes when a Blemiſh ſticks hard upon a Pope, they will tell us, that is as he is, Humane; but here the Infallibility is ſtabb'd through both Sides, for *Tyrius* ſaith, That *Arnulph* not only cheated the Pope, but the whole Church too, with his Golden Rhetorick. Theſe juggling Diſtinctions, and double Capacities, have been of dangerous Conſequence to Kings, whoſe Subjects from thence, no Doubt, have ſuck'd the Notion of murde ing the Perſonal to preſerve the Politick Capacity. But the End of *Tyrius*'s Account is yet more ſcandalous, for he ſays, "*Arnulph*, through the Favour of the Apoſtolick "See, returning Home, repoſſeſſes the See of *Je-*

"*ruſa*-

" *rusalem*, with Licence to live after the same Man-
" ner which drew on his Deposition." From hence we may justly infer, that *Arnulph* had by his Bribes not only insinuated into the Pope and Church's Favour, so as to gain a Pardon for Crimes past, but a Dispensation to repeat the same for the Time to come. Why, as has been said before, the Editors should insert improbable Forgeries, fabulous Antiquities, Stories that have not the least Weight of Truth in them, and scandalous Narratives, which serve but to enervate their Cause, and blacken instead of brightening the Characters of those they would illustrate, is past my Conception, unless it be for the Sake of those racy Touches and Innuendo's of Universality. And truly this Encroachment of the Patriarch of *Rome* over him of *Jerusalem*, is as large a Step Eastward, as any of them had made Westward: But how scandalous a one I need not descant on, it tells it self.

A. D. 1116. Pope *Paschal* calls a Council at *Rome* upon a very slight Occasion, *viz.* that of Prerogative between the two Abbots of *Cluny* and *Cassino*; the former calling himself *Abbot of Abbots*, tho' the Title was confer'd on the latter, *Cassino* being the Spring of the Monastick State, and from which all Monks received the Rule of St. *Benedict*. This was an Arrogance undoubtedly assum'd by the Abbots in Imitation of the *Servus Servorum Dei*, that lords it over all he can; and therefore no Wonder to hear it confirm'd by him. Had an Orthodox Bishop, or a Secular Priest, offer'd at such an Innovation, he had met with a different Usage, and been incapacitated for ever aspiring again. This Sentence, which was pronounc'd in Favour of the Abbey of *Cassino*, was done by *John* the Chancellor of *Rome*, who was bred up a Monk there; and therefore might be supposed to declare in Fa-

vour

vour of the Place of his Education. Tho' considering his Station then, and the Prospect of Advancement, his being a Favourite of Pope *Urban* II. who made him Chancellor of the *Roman* Church, and of Pope *Paschal* II. who made him Cardinal Deacon of St. *Mary's in Cosmedin*; I say, considering these Things, we need not wonder at his encouraging an ambitious Innovation in the Title of *Abbot of Abbots* in another, when himself could not but have a Prospect of the highest Pitch of Honour in the Church, tho' under the Title of *Servant of Servants*; his Intimacy with the two foresaid Popes, especially Pope *Paschal* II. was a sure Recommendation, according to the Editors: *In Ecclesia Romana semper irreprehensibiliter Paschali Pontifici collaboraverit*: "He serv'd Pope *Paschal* so "obligingly in the *Roman* Church, that he could not "be found Fault with." *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 813. This accordingly came to pass, for in Thirteen Days after the Death of Pope *Paschal*, he is chosen Pope at *Rome* by the Name of

[1118.] *Gelasius* II. and consecrated at *Gaietta* the 24th of *February* following. His Reign was short, and full of Tumult and Noise, most unheard of Barbarities being committed on both Sides; especially on the Emperor's Side, whose Partisans practic'd all the Cruelty imaginable on their Opposers. After various Attempts and Disappointments, Pope *Gelasius* retires into *France*, the *usual Asylum of distress'd Popes*, says *Cabbasutius*, *p.* 402. *col.* 2. where within a Year he died in the Monastery of *Cluny*. His Successor

[1119.] Pope *Calistus* II. formerly called *Guido*, was a Man of a different Spirit: He was well descended, claiming Kin with the Emperor of *Germany*, and Kings of *England* and *France*, very skilful in Secular Affairs, and well read in Ecclesiasticks:

Which

Which recommended him to the Choice of those Cardinals that with Pope *Gelasius* took Sanctuary at *Cluny*; where, on the 4th of *February*, he was chosen, and the *March* following crown'd in the same Place. He was as active as politick; and therefore, not to lose Time, he calls a Council at *Rhemes*, where he revives the Quarrel of his Predecessors, in condemning the Claim of Lay-Investitures, Simony, and the Marriage of the Clergy: At the same Time excommunicating the Emperor *Henry* V. *Burdinus* the Antipope, and their Adherents. This was in *November*; and the Beginning of the next Year he marches into *Italy*, where being receiv'd with great Applause, and Concourse of much People, *Burdinus* was so terrified, that he left *Rome*, and fled to *Sutrium*, where he fortified himself. Thither *Calistus* pursues and besieges him; where in a short Time a Battle is fought between these Two military Prelates, and *Burdinus* lost the Day, was taken Prisoner, and used very scurvily; for being cover'd with a Sheep-Skin, he was set on a Camel's Back, with his Face to the Tail, which he held in his Hand instead of a Bridle. [Note, That this Pope did not hold the Tail in his Hands after they were cut off, as some of his Predecessors aforesaid did.] And being thus expos'd to the Malice and Ridicule of the People, he was shut up in the Monastry of *Cava*, and condemn'd to perpetual Imprisonment and Pennance.

The same Month and Year that the Council of *Rhemes* was held by Pope *Calistus*, *Goufred* Archbishop of *Rouen* in *Normandy*, returning from *Rhemes*, call'd a Council at *Rouen*. Among the rest of the Acts of this Council, he, under Pain of Excommunication, forbid any of his Presbyters to have any Conversation with Women; which was one of the Canons of the Council of *Rhemes*. The Clergy

gy look upon this as an Oppreſſion and Innovation; whereupon the Archbiſhop orders one *Albert*, an eloquent Man, as he was going to ſpeak, to be apprehended, and caſt into Priſon. This Archbiſhop, according to *Orderic. Vitalis Eccleſ. Hiſt. l.* 12. our Countryman, was a very raſh, imprudent Man, paſſionate, and impatient of any Oppoſition. The reſt of the Prieſts being ſurpriz'd at this unuſual Treatment, to ſee an innocent Man, without Examination, or Charge of Guilt, hurried out of the Church to Priſon like a Thief, were in Diſpute whether to defend themſelves or to fly. In ſhort, this ended in a diſorderly Tumult, much Miſchief being done on both Sides: But I do not find that the Archbiſhop gain'd his Point; and if he did, it was an odd Way of propagating by Force.

A. D. 1122, in the Month of *March*, a Council was call'd at *Rome*, in which *Oderiſius* Abbot of *Caſſino* was conſecrated, where the Monks behav'd themſelves ſo proudly, that the Biſhops, provok'd by their arrogant and ſaucy Carriage, complain'd in Council of them; ſaying, That they were arriv'd to that Height now, that there remain'd nothing but to lay aſide their Ring and Croſier, and wait on them: For they had Villages, Churches, Tythes, Oblations of Living and Dead. And then, turning to the Pope, they ſaid, The Religion and Honour of the Clergy is ſunk and periſhed, whilſt the Monks, forgetting their Vows, inſatiably encroach on the Rights of the Biſhops, and hunt after their Poſſeſſions: That they, who had left the World, and all the Deſires of it, did not ceaſe moſt greedily to purſue worldly Gain; and quitting their quiet Retreat provided by their Founder St. *Bennet*, were buſied in nothing ſo much as ſeizing on the Epiſcopal Rights. The Monks

were

were not behind-hand in their Defence, urging that they ceas'd not Night and Day to implore the Mercy of God for the Salvation of the whole World: And what would become of them if the Holy Sanctions of the Popes ſhould be violated? Nor had the Abbots of *Caſſino* deſerved ſo ill of the Apoſtolick See, that in this Pontificate they ſhould looſe what ſo many Emperors, Kings, Dukes, and *Roman* Biſhops, had offered to St. *Bennet*. After this, the Biſhop of *Liguria* ſtood up, and, in Behalf of the Monaſtick State, urg'd, That whatever the Biſhops might ſay of the Monks, yet it was upon juſt Ground, that our Predeceſſors founded and enriched Monaſteries: For in the Infancy of the Church there were Two Orders inſtituted; one, which labour'd in the Word and Preaching; the other, which continued in Prayer: One, which led an active, the other, a contemplative Life. At laſt, to put an End to the Diſpute, the Pope commanding Silence, declared thus in Favour of the Monks, though againſt his own Order: "The "Church of *Caſſino* was not founded by Man, but "by Jeſus Chriſt; to whoſe Government the Ho- "ly Father *Bennet* reſtor'd it, purging it from Idols, "and making it eminent throughout the World "for its Holy Rule, Miracles, and his own corpo- "ral *Requiem*, and conſtituting it the Head of the "Monaſtick Order. The ſame venerable Place "has been repair'd and rebuilt by ſeveral *Roman* "Pontiffs, and hath prov'd a ſafe Retreat for the "Sons of the *Roman* Church both in Proſperity "and Adverſity. Therefore, in Imitation of our "Holy Predeceſſors, we decree, That the Mona- "ſtery of *Caſſino* be for ever free from all Subje- "ction, and continue under the Protection and "Defence of the *Roman* Church only: But for "other Monaſteries, they were to remain in the

"ſame

"ſame Order they were founded." Which, conſidering the many Privileges and Immunities they were all endowed with at firſt, were large enough, none of them paying any Subjection to the Biſhop of the Dioceſe they live in, though oblig'd by many Canons to it. This Determination of the Biſhop of *Rome*, in Favour of the Monks, and in Oppoſition to his own Order, was ſcandalous and baſe; nay, the Editors plainly tell us the ill Uſe the Monks made of it, for as ſoon as the Abbot had finiſhed his Affairs at *Rome*, he returned to his Monaſtery, and was received by all the Brethren in a moſt ſolemn and magnificent Proceſſion. Of all this, ſee *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 888, 889.

The ſame Year a Council was call'd at *Worms*, in which the Caſe of Inveſtitures, which had laſted about Fifty Years, was ended; the Emperor for his Part delivering up all Claim and Pretenſion to any: The Pope on his Side conceding, That all Elections of Biſhops and Abbots in the Teutonick Dominions ſhould be made in the Preſence of the Emperor, without Simony or Violence; and that if any Diſcord ſhould ariſe, the Emperor with his Power ſhould aſſiſt the honeſt Party with the Council and Judgment of the Metropolitan and his Biſhops; but that the Perſon elected ſhould receive his *Regalia* from the Emperor, except in thoſe which belong to the Church of *Rome*.

There is one Paſſage which the Editors take Notice of in the Council of *Rhemes*, juſt now mention'd, from *Eadmer* the Monk, *Hiſtor. l.* 5. and which anſwers no End, but to expoſe Pope *Caliſtus* II. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 878. The Story is thus: "*Thurſtan* Archbiſhop of *York* Elect would not pay "that Submiſſion to the See of *Canterbury* which "was demanded, and indeed was his Duty. Upon which, *Henry* I. King of *England* eſpouſes "the

"the Interest of the See of *Canterbury*, refusing to
"give Leave to *Thurstan* to assist at the Council of
"*Rhemes*, till he had promised that he would not
"receive Episcopal Benediction from the Pope.
"But before this, says *Eadmer*, *ibid.* the King sent
"a Messenger to the Pope, informing him of the
"Occasion of the Difference between the Arch-
"bishops of *Canterbury* and *York*; obliging him
"not to consecrate *Thurstan* himself, nor suffer
"him to be consecrated by any but the Archbishop
"of *Canterbury*, as the Custom was; for if he did,
"he would not allow him to set Foot in any Part
"of his Dominion. And if his Holiness, by Ver-
"tue of his Apostolick Authority, should oppose
"him in this, he would persist in his Resolution to
"the Loss of his Crown. The Pope replies; He
"would not have the King think he intended to
"do any Thing against his Inclination: [A pious
"Reserve, considering his Actions in this Affair.]
"For it never was in his Thoughts to act against
"the Dignity of the See of *Canterbury*, over which
"so many eminent Fathers had presided. The
"credulous Messenger, believing the Professions
"of the Apostolick Father, thought himself se-
"cure in his Embassy: Till coming to *Rhemes*, he,
"not without great Surprize, found Archbishop
"*Thurstan* and others prepared to receive the Apo-
"stolick Benediction. But the Truth appearing
"beyond Doubt or Contradiction, *John*, the Arch-
"deacon of *Canterbury*, to whose Management
"this Affair was intrusted, stood up in the Pre-
"sence of the Pope and the other Bishops, and
"loudly declared against the Injustice done to the
"See of *Canterbury*; and that though he was Pope,
"he could not justify his depriving the See of *Can-*
"*terbury* of her Rights, which had never denied
"her Duty to any where it was due. To this the

" Pope anſwer'd, That he would do nothing in
" Prejudice of the Church of *Canterbury*; but ſa-
" ving her Dignity and Right, ſhould purſue his
" Purpoſe. This ſtruck the Aſſembly with Amaze-
" ment, eſpecially when they ſaw the Pope act
" ſo apparent an Injuſtice: For he conſecrated
" *Thurſtan* Archbiſhop of *York*; thereby defrauding
" his Lord of his Allegiance, to whom (under
" God) it was due. The Pope having ſummon'd
" ſeveral Biſhops to attend at this Conſecration,
" *Hubald* Biſhop of *Lyons* could by no Means be
" perſuaded to be preſent at it, as plainly perceiving Things went not right, and abhorring the
" Injuſtice offer'd to the See of *Canterbury*. As
" for the Biſhops of *England*, who were order'd by
" the King's Special Command to attend here,
" they were not yet arriv'd, ſo that they were ignorant of what had paſs'd in this Affair. But
" as ſoon as the King knew of it, he forbad *Thurſtan*, or any of his Aſſociates, to return into
" *Normandy*, *England*, or any Part of his Dominions." I ask Pardon for being ſo particular, and conſequently tedious, in this Tranſaction; but the Truth requires it: For the Pope, who was chief Manager in this Affair, ſupported a Suffragan againſt his Metropolitan, and his King too; whom notwithſtanding he diſobey'd, and went to the Council of *Rhemes*, againſt his poſitive Orders to the contrary. The King dealt fairly and aboveboard with the Pope, and requeſted him not to do any Thing in Prejudice of the See of *Canterbury*: But the Pope acted very diſingenuouſly with the King; for after he had promiſed him to do nothing in this Affair againſt his Inclinations, or in Prejudice of the See of *Canterbury*, he perfidiouſly breaks his Word in both, by conſecrating *Thurſtan* Archbiſhop of *York*. This was look'd upon as ſo

black a Piece of Perfidy, that *Hubald*, the good Archbishop of *Lyons*, could by no Perswasions or Commands be indueed to be present at this Consecration, esteeming it an unjust Violation of the Rights of the See of *Canterbury*; besides the Scandal in perfidiously breaking his Word.

A. D. 1123, the Sixth Lateran and First General Council of this Century was held at *Rome*; wherein the Conditions of Peace between the Emperor and the Pope, made the Year before at the Council of *Worms*, about Investitures, are confirmed, and the Emperor and his Adherents absolved from the Censures of the Church, and the Acts of the Antipope, *Gregory* VIII. rescinded. There were likewise Twenty two Canons relating to Ecclesiastick Discipline made in this Council, most of which are taken from the Council of *Claromont*, under Pope *Urban* II. *A. D.* 1095. The Eleventh Canon of this Council is in Substance the same with the Second of the Council of *Claromont*; but the Eleventh here is more particular. The Second of *Claromont* says, "Whosoever shall "take a Journey to *Jerusalem* to serve the Church, "[*i. e.* in War,] that Journey shall be reckon'd to "him for a general Pennance." *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 507. But the Eleventh of this *Lateran* Council is much more full, and seems to be explanatory of the Second of *Claromont*, because it mentions Pope *Urban*, *viz.* "They who go to *Jerusalem* to defend "the Christians, and oppose the Infidels, SHALL "RECEIVE A PARDON OF ALL THEIR "SINS; and their Houses, Families, and Goods, "shall remain under the Protection of St. *Peter*, "and the *Roman* Church, according to the Decree "of the Holy Father, Pope *Urban*." This Canon is a plain Illustration of the former; and shews, That Pope *Callistus* II. was very ready to assert

 what

what his Predeceſſor, Pope *Urban* II. had ſo advantagiouſly ſtarted; for *Urban* II. was the Firſt Biſhop of *Rome* that aſſumed this particular Branch of Power; (though it may be included in their Univerſal Supremacy.) This is plain from *Stephen Baluzius*, who, in his Notes on the latter Part of this Canon, on another Occaſion, calls Pope *Urban* II. *Belli ſacri in Oriente gerundi Autor: The Beginner of the Holy War in the Eaſt*; affirming the ſame Practice in his Succeſſors, *viz.* who gave the ſame Indulgence of Sins to thoſe that went againſt the *Saracens* in *Spain*. *Ibid. p.* 900. Here they pretend Authority for their Practice, which immediately form'd it into a Cuſtom, which ſoon becomes as prevalent as a Law. But the Profitableneſs of this, I believe, advanc'd it beyond any Thing: And that Man that can be deluded into the Belief of ſo extenſive a Power of Forgiving, no Doubt, will give largely at his Death for the Security of his Soul: (And a happy Compoſition too, if it could be!) Thus came in Indulgences; from whence ſpawn'd perſonal Merit, and many other profitable Appendages to both; of which the Biſhop and Court of *Rome* are ſtill tenacious. *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 399. talks very formally of this Canon; and, I think, more than he can prove: For firſt he ſays, that formerly Penitents were refuſed going to the Wars; for which he ſhews his Authority from one of Pope *Siricius*'s Epiſtles: But of what Force thoſe Epiſtles are with the Judicious, let the Reader look back to the Year 385, and he will ſoon be ſatisfied. But granting this to have been ſo, he tells us: "That nevertheleſs the Eaſtern Expedition ſo "ſway'd with the Fathers of the Council of *Clarmont*, and other ſucceeding Councils, that "they look'd upon the delivering the Chriſtians "of *Paleſtine* from the Tyranny of the Mahome-

"tans

"tans to be of very great Moment; and that the "innumerable Hazards, Fatigues, and Expence, "both of Blood and Treasure, which attended "that distant War, seem'd to exceed the Severity "of usual Pennances; so that this Way of Com-"muting might expiate what Sins soever more suf-"ficiently than any Canonical Punishment." *Cabbasutius* indeed has put as plausible a Gloss on the Matter as it is capable of: But, with Submission, I think a shameful Conviction of Sin, a hearty Sorrow and pungent Contrition for it, and an aggravating Confession of it in all its unhappy Circumstances, is a Punishment (if duly submitted to) far exceeding all Temporal Inflictions; and no Punishment like a Canonical Pennance, conscienciously enjoin'd and perform'd. If hard Campaigns in a Foreign Land, immense Treasures, and Seas of Blood, were to commute for Crimes, the vilest and most unnatural Sins have been atton'd for in later Days. But to return: Whatever the Design of Pope *Urban* II. and *Calistus* II. might be in proposing this Commutation of Personal Service for Canonical Pennance, it's certain it introduced the Grant of Indulgences on other Occasions for any Term of Years. And thus one of the most profitable Parts of their Income commenc'd upon a false Ground, and has continued so ever since.

[1124.] Pope *Honorius* II. before call'd *Lambert*, is, according to the Editors, most improperly inserted in the Catalogue of Popes; for in Right he was the Schismatick Intruder upon *Theobald*, or, as some will have him, *Theodulph*, who was canonically chosen. However, as the Editors tell us from the *Cassinian* Chronicle, *Honorius*'s Party being the stronger, the Favourers of *Theobald* came over to him; so that Strength and Number carries the

Day. *Conrad. Urſperg.* tells the Story with much Plauſibility their Way; but *Tyrius in Bell. Sacr. l.* 13. *c.* 15. tells it another Way: And notwithſtanding what *Labbé*, or any of the Editors, may ſay of their *Incomparable Treaſure*, *Conrad*, or any other of their Creatures, very few, if any, deſerve that *Encomium Voſſius* gives of this good Man, *viz. That he was modeſt, prudent, of a penetrating Judgment, a ſincere Lover of Truth, and (conſidering the Age he liv'd in) learned and elegant.* De Hiſt. Lat. l. 2. c. 53. *Tyrius*'s Words are theſe: "Pope *Caliſtus* II. being "dead, one *Lambert*, by Country a *Bononian*, and "Biſhop of *Oſtia*, is ſubſtituted in his Room by "the Name of *Honorius*. This Election was not "without Contention with one *Theobald*, Cardi-"nal-Prieſt of *Anaſtaſia*. And becauſe this Ele-"ction of *Honorius* look'd uncanonically, [*minus* "*canonicè*] after Twelve Days he laid down his "Mitre and Mantle in the Preſence of his Bre-"thren." His thus diveſting himſelf of the *Regalia*, argued an irregular uncanonical Proceeding in the Election. But then the old Salvo heals all. "The Brethren, as well Biſhops, as Prieſts and "Cardinal-Deacons, obſerving his Humility, "[though Craft and Ambition had been more "proper Terms,] and willing to prevent any In-"novation in the *Roman* Church, reſolved to a-"mend what they had raſhly before done, and "therefore afreſh recognize Pope *Honorius*, and "pay him the uſual Obedience, as Paſtor and "Univerſal Father." Thus *Tyrius*; that is, they elected him anew, and ſo ſet all right again. This, as has been already obſerved, is not the firſt Time of playing this Game. But if ſuch an Election at this be allowed, they may as well ſay, Reconciliation may be made without Satisfaction.

[1130.] *Inno-*

[1130.] *Innocent* II. before call'd *Gregory*, next ascends the Chair. He was a Man of Family, born in *Rome*, bred a Monk in the Lateran, afterwards Abbot of the Monastry of St. *Nicolas* and *Benedict*. By *Urban* II. he was made Cardinal-Deacon of St. *Angelo*, *A. D.* 1118. He followed Pope *Calistus* II. when he fled into *France*. This was, no Doubt, a great Inducement, as some of his late Predecessors found, of his Advancement to the Pontificate, their sharing the Fortune of the exil'd Pope endearing and recommending them. However it was, this *Gregory* is by the Name of *Innocent* II. elected Pope in the Room of *Honorius* II. on the 17th of *February*, 1130. At the same Time, another Party of Cardinals chose one *Peter Leo*, a Cardinal likewise, by the Name of *Anaclete* II. Which of these Two Parties was the Major, the Editors cannot make out. If the Election of the Bishop of *Rome* at this Time was, as formerly, by the Clergy and People of *Rome*, then, according to *Cabbasutius*, *p.* 403. *col.* 1. *Innocent* II. was the Antipope; for he was chosen by the *sanior Pars Cardinalium*, and that too before the Death of Pope *Honorius* was published. But the others, *qui nec moniti nec vocati fuerant*; "who had neither Notice, "nor were call'd, [a very unfair Way of proceed-"ing in an Election] the same Day they knew of "the Death of the Pope, repair'd to St. *Mark*'s, "where, in a publick Concourse of Bishops, Car-"dinals, and other of the Clergy and Nobility "of *Rome*, they unanimously chose *Peter Leo*, Car-"dinal of St. *Mary*'s, Pope." These are *Cabbasutius*'s own Words; I am sure I do not wrong him in the Version. What greater Violation of Privilege can there be than this? If *Innocent*'s Election must be allowed to be valid, then it is plain that the College of Cardinals had subverted the old re-

gular Way of Electing, which was by the Clergy and People; and *Anaclete*'s Election, according to *Cabbasutius*, was more just, he being chosen by the Bishops, Cardinals, and People of *Rome*. The Editors indeed would make *Innocent*'s Election appear more plausible, by saying, That he was chosen *potissimorum Cardinalium Voto: By the Chief of the Cardinals*. Lab. T. 10. p. 945. This may be indeed, and yet the Election in it self undue; for *Innocent*'s having the Chief does not imply a Majority, which alone carries an Election. And tho' a few Lines after they say, That *Anaclete* was chosen by a few of the Cardinals, (leaving out the rest of the Clergy and People) this yet does not make *Innocent*'s Election the clearer; for they must either give up the ancient Custom of Electing by Clergy and People, and so admit this Encroachment of the Cardinals, or else *Anaclete*'s Election will appear not only more plausible, but more just, and prove *Innocent* the Antipope; which has too often been the Case of the Editors, and many of their Authors, in placing Schism on the wrong Party. I would not make Use of the Argument of Majority, but that it was in *Anaclete*'s Case the most clear, according to their Champion *Cabbasutius*: His Election was not by the Mob, or inferior Sort of People, but his Number was compos'd of Bishops, Cardinals, and other Clergy, with the Nobility of *Rome*. Besides, *Cabbasutius*, *p.* 403. *col.* 2. in the Characters of these Candidates, says, "That *Innocent* was much inferior to his Rival *Anaclete*, who outshin'd him in Nobility, Wealth, and Popularity, both among the Quality and common People." So that, all consider'd, an easy Inference might be made in Favour of *Anaclete*, from the Editors and *Cabbasutius*'s own Words.

Both Elections being over, *Anaclete* drives *Innocent* out of *Rome*, and excommunicates him; each thundring *Anathema's* against the other with the highest Resentment imaginable. *Innocent* retires to *France*, the old *Asylum* of distressed Popes, where he is received, and by the *French*, *English*, and *Germans*, acknowledged for lawful and rightful Bishop of *Rome*, which in the Year 1131, is confirmed in the Council of *Rhemes*. *A. D.* 1133, the Emperor *Lotharius* restores *Innocent* to *Rome*, where *Anaclete* notwithstanding keeps his Ground, and obstinately struggles for the Papacy with his Rival *Innocent*, till Death put an End to the Quarrel between them Two, which had lasted Eight Years. The Editors and *Cabbasutius* agree in the Story of Pope *Innocent's* refusing the Right of Investitures to the Emperor *Lotharius*. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 945. *Cab. p.* 404. But if we consider the Time and Occasion, it's scarcely within the Verge of Probability, that the Pope should or durst refuse the Emperor *Lotharius* any Thing. As to the Time when they say *Lotharius* requested this of the Pope, it was in the Year 1132, being the Year before the Emperor restor'd *Innocent*; who at that Time was in Exile, and soliciting for Aid to facilitate his Return: At this Time, and in a Council, *viz.* that of *Liege*, in a mighty Concourse of Clergy and Nobility, it was, that the Emperor *Lotharius* demanded these Investitures of Bishopricks, *&c.* which had, to the great Detriment of the Empire, been separated from it. This so startled and amazed the *Romans*, that they began to be more apprehensive of Danger here than what they dreaded at *Rome*. The whole Assembly was so surpriz'd, that they could not tell what to do; till St. *Bernard* stood up, who very briskly oppos'd the Emperor; and by the great Influence he had over him, wrought him into better Temper.

Temper. *Ib. p.* 916, 980. This is ſo far from being a Proof that the Pope refuſed the Emperor his Demand, that the Editors themſelves, in the very Paſſage they cite, confirm the contrary, and make it plainly appear, that the Pope did part with Inveſtitures, at leaſt in Part; Witneſs the Grant of this Pope, of the Inveſtiture of the Counteſs *Mathilda*'s Lands to *Lotharius*, and likewiſe the Epiſtle of this Pope to the Emperor and Empreſs, both dated at *Rome*. Nor do the *Salvo's* at the End of the Epiſtle any Way detract from the Right of Inveſtiture; for *Lotharius* is by Pope *Innocent* II. inveſted with the Ring, paying the Sum of 100 *l. per Ann.* to the Pope and his Succeſſors. They rail moſt unmercifully againſt *Petrus Diacon.* becauſe in *Chron. Caſſin. l.* 4. *c.* 99. he tells us, "That the "Pope entring *Germany*, he is received by the Em- "peror near *Liege*; on whom he beſtowed the "Lands of the Counteſs *Mathilda*, confirming the "Grant with the Ring and Staff. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 988. This they moſt furiouſly condemn, calling him Lyar, and Traducer of the Catholick Father, *Innocent* II. urging the Improbability of the Thing, which they ſay, according to *Peter*, was done at *Liege*; whereas the Grant it ſelf bears Date at *Rome*. This may be; nay, I believe it, *viz.* that the Grant was dated at *Rome*, and yet the Thing granted was given in the Council of *Liege*; it being a common Thing, for Inſtruments of this Nature to be made and dated in Places diſtant from whence the Grants were firſt made. But notwithſtanding they deny this Story of Inveſtitures in general, yet they own it in Part, by acknowledging the *Diploma* of the Pope for the Inveſtiture of the Counteſs *Mathilda*'s Lands in the Emperor *Lotharius*. And truly they muſt be Poſſeſſors of a moſt obdurate Front to deny what is ſo expreſly mention'd in the Second

Epiſtle

Epistle of this Pope. *Ib. p.* 946. But before we part with this Affair of Investitures, the forementioned St. *Bernard*, who opposed the Emperor in this Case, must not be pass'd over so slightly. His Character was so bright, that the Editors could not have fixed upon a more considerable Man in that Age to have adorn'd their Cause; and yet what they introduce him to assert in their Behalf is no more than this: *Audacter resistens Regi, Verbum malignum mirâ Libertate redarguit, mirâ Auctoritate compescuit.* Which amounts to no more than this, *viz.* "That "he brought the King into better Temper:" Which might be, and yet not relinquish his Claim of Investitures, which these Words cannot be said to imply. But St. *Bernard*'s Character, they think, would give a Varnish to any Thing they should prefix his Name to; and for that Reason they introduce him, though to no real Purpose. He was the Glory of the Age he liv'd in, being a Man of admirable Piety and Learning, a strenuous Promoter of the Church's Interest, and Restorer of her Peace; for it was he that put an End to a long and flagrant Schism, by prevailing with *Victor* the Antipope to submit to *Innocent*. I need not, to enhance the Value of this good Man, describe him in his publick Capacity, in which he perform'd Wonders. He was, in short, a polite Humanist, a profound Theologist, and elegant and learned beyond the Capacity of the Age he liv'd in. So sagacious a Man in publick Affairs could not be blinded as to private ones; and therefore the Editors did very little consult their Advantage, in bringing in this good Man to grace their Pretensions; for he saw and lamented the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, and bravely attempted a Reformation of them; as appears in his 290th Epistle, *A. D.* 1151, to the Cardinal-Bishop of *Ostia*; wherein,

in, after he had deplor'd the degenerate State of the Church, and the profligate Morals of a certain Legate of the Pope's, he adds: "Read these Letters to my Lord, [the Pope] he will consider "what ought to be done with such a Man. I "have discharged my Duty; yet I speak with the "same Zeal I was wont. It is good for him to "purge his own Court, if he would discharge his "Conscience." Such a Man as this, if the Editors had consider'd his Character truly, cannot be supposed to favour Innovations, Encroachments, or Fictions. The Fourth Epistle of this Pope to *William* Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, shews a faint Struggling for the expiring Rights of that Patriarchate, but in vain; for Pope *Innocent* in a most magisterial Way chastises Patriarch *William*, for presuming to hinder or prevent *Fulcher* Archbishop of *Tyre* from taking his Pall from the Bishop of *Rome*; and yet *Tyre* was never reckon'd within the Patriarchate or Cognizance of *Rome*, or her Bishop: However, he charges Patriarch *William*, by Vertue of his Apostolical Authority, no Way to molest or disturb *Fulcher* in any Thing, but to assist and help him, and within Forty Days after the Receipt of this Epistle to do him plenary Justice in the Complaint laid before him; otherwise let him look to it, for he would withdraw *Fulcher* and his Suffragans from their Obedience to the Patriarchate of *Jerusalem*. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 949. This is tyrannical indeed; for he owns, That the Patriarch of *Jerusalem* had a Right to the Obedience of the Archbishop of *Tyre*, and his Suffragans; yet he first encourages him to take up his Pall at *Rome*, and threatens the Patriarch of *Jerusalem* for offering to hinder him; and afterwards threatens to make the Archbishop of *Tyre* and his Suffragans withdraw their Obedience from their lawful Patriarch.

The

The domineering Power which the Bishop of *Rome* at this Time assumed over the Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, and other Eastern Patriarchs and Bishops, is grounded upon the old Topick of Universality, dated from St. *Peter* and Evangelical Authority; tho' it is beyond Dispute, that the Gospel says not a Word of it, neither did St. *Peter* ever act any Thing like it. There cannot be a higher Profanation of Sacred Writ, than to cite it in Confirmation of a Falsity, which this Pope does in the Beginning of this very Epistle: *Magisterium totius Ecclesiæ & Ecclesiasticæ Institutionis beato Petro Apostolorum Principi cælesti Privilegio esse collatum, Evangelica declarat Auctoritas. ib. p.* 948. *That the Dominion of the whole Church, and Ecclesiastical Affairs, was confer'd on St.* Peter, *the Prince of the Apostles by Divine Authority, the Gospel declares.* Where this is to be found, let them declare if they can; I am sure the contrary is to be prov'd from holy Scripture, which never yet was known to contradict it self. The Four Evangelists agree in this, That our Blessed Lord, when he chose his Disciples, first chose *Peter*, *Mat.* 4. 18. *Mark* 1. 16. *Luke* 5. 10. *John* 1. 42. but not one of them says a Word of his being invested with the Universal Jurisdiction they since have claim'd. But the clearest Proof of all in this Case is the Council of *Jerusalem*, which we read of in the *Acts*, Chap. 15. where, after St. *Paul*, *Barnabas*, and *Peter* himself had deliver'd their Sentiments of the Controversy in Hand, St. *James*, as Bishop of the Place, pronounc'd the peremptory decretal Sentence, *v.* 19, 20. to which the whole Council unanimously consented, *v.* 22. no one in it assuming a superior Right to St. *James*, who as formally presided in this Council, as any Bishop ever did in any other since. And here, I think, it cannot be counted unfair to fight the Editors with their own Weapons, and that

that is their Forgeries: For they, as has been often hinted, when Occasion offers, spare not to produce Forgeries, and such as themselves have mark'd for Fictions, in Testimony of considerable Points. I desire Pardon for this Digression, which may be allow'd to be entertaining, if not instructing. The fore-mentioned Epistle of Pope *Innocent* II. assumes an Universal Supremacy, even over *Jerusalem* itself. And yet St. *Clement*'s First Epistle is directed to James *the Bishop of Bishops, ruling the* Hebrew *Church at* Jerusalem, *and all the Churches every where founded by Divine Providence. Lab. T.* 1. *p.* 82. *Bin. p.* 27. This was a great Oversight in the Forger of this Epistle, for certainly the Title of *Bishop of Bishops* was much superior to that affectatious Humility in the Title of *Servus Servorum Dei*. But then giving such a plenary Power in the other Part of the Direction of this Epistle, as *Ruler of the* Hebrew *Church at* Jerusalem, *and all the Churches every where, &c.* was such a Contradiction to the *Roman Universality*, as they cannot recall. There was indeed a great deal of Reason for an extraordinary Compliment to the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, who, besides his other rare Endowments and Qualifications, was called the Brother of our Lord, being the Son of *Joseph* by a former Wife; but whatever other Design the Forger of this Epistle of St. *Clement*'s might have, it is plain he had no Thoughts of vesting the Universal Supremacy in the Bishop of *Rome*, tho' *Bellarmine, de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14. does: For it is most certain, that tho' St. *Peter* was at *Rome*, and laid the Foundation of the Church there, (which I readily grant) yet, that he held the Pontifical Chair 25 Years, as the *Romanists* affirm, I cannot be induc'd to believe; for, to avoid the Tediousness of being particular, which is easily to be prov'd, the Apostolick History in general, the Epistles of St. *Paul*, the

whole

whole Course of St. *Peter*'s Life, and many Difficulties, which Sacred Antiquity can produce, and which the most subtil Sophisms cannot elude, absolutely condemn and disown such Falsities; with which the Testimonies of the Ancients agrees, particularly *Origen* and *Lactantius*, who affirm that St. *Peter*, towards the End of his Life, in the Reign of the Emperor *Nero*, came to *Rome*, which he enobled with his Blood. St. *Peter* of *Alexandria* says the same, and many others. These Steps of Sacred Antiquity make it appear so plain, that *Valesius*, *Henschenius*, *Papebrochius*, *Baluzius*, and other the most eminent Chronologers, being fully convinc'd, have given up the Cause: But to go on with the Proof against the Papal Supremacy out of their own Forgeries.

The next Instance against it is out of one of Pope *Hyginus*'s Epistles, which forbids all *Foreign Jurisdiction*, because it is unfit they should be judg'd Abroad, who have Judges at Home. *Lab. T.* 1. *p.* 567. *Bin. p.* 66. *col.* 2. And yet this is an apparent Forgery, as has been shewn already in that Pope's Life.

The Third Epistle of Pope *Fabian*, which is as notorious a Forgery as any, being stolen out of the Decrees of Pope *Sixtus* III. appoints, *That every Cause shall be tried where the Crime is committed*; which Passage is also in a genuine Epistle of St. *Cyprian* to *Cornelius*. *Lab. T.* 1. *p.* 698. *Bin. p.* 119. *col.* 2. And all Foreign Jurisdiction is again forbid in Pope *Felix* his Second Epistle, *ib. p.* 906. which Passages do utterly destroy Appeals to *Rome*, unless they can prove all the Crimes in the World are committed there. The Second Epistle of Pope *Fabian* allows *the People to reprove their Bishop, if he err in Matters of Faith*. *Lab. T.* 1. *p.* 640. *Bin. p.* 97. *col.* 1. And the same Liberty is given to the People in *Cornelius*'s

nelius's Second Epistle, *ib. p.* 671. which seems to make People Judges in Matters of Faith, a Thing which the modern *Romanists* charge upon others as a great Error; and yet we find from their own Accounts, in the Life of Pope *Liberius*, the People were so sensible of his Erring in Faith, that they refused Communion with him; and it was high Time to avoid him, when, after all the pretended Infallibility, he more than once laps'd into Idolatry, by sacrificing to Heathen Idols. From these and many other Passages we may see, that these Impostures do not in all Points agree with the present *Roman* Church; and by their too great Assurance very often invalidate what they would have the World believe. But to return to Pope *Innocent* II.

The Fifth Epistle of this Pope to the foresaid Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, is of the same Style, and to the same Purpose; but with this Reserve in case of Obedience, that tho' he recommends *Fulcher* Archbishop of *Tyre* to the Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, to be obedient to him; yet *Fulcher* pays this Obedience to the Patriarch, but by Command of the holy *Roman* Church. [*Ex Mandato Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Romanæ tibi obedit.*] Which Passage the same Epistle a little more explains towards the End: Where, after the Pope charges the Patriarch to be very tender and careful of *Fulcher*, he bids him, "take Care not to oppress under Pretence of Subjection, which he and the Church of *Jerusalem* "enjoy'd but by the Benefit of the Apostolick See. "*Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 949.

The Seventh Epistle is to *Ralph* Patriarch of *Antioch*, to whose Patriarchate the Archbishop of *Tyre* formerly had been subject; but, it seems, was encourag'd in his Revolt by Pope *Innocent* II. The Design of the Epistle is, "To command the Pa-

"triarch

" triarch of *Antioch* to oblige the Suffragans of " the Archbishoprick of *Tyre* to be obedient to " their Archbishop *Fulcher*." And yet in the End of this Epistle the Pope wishes, " That Prelates " and their Subjects may observe each others " Rights without Contradiction." *ib. p.* 950. Now how far the Pope observ'd this, or with what Face he could recommend the Observance of that to others, which he himself at the same Time openly violated, I leave to any one to judge by the Matter of this Epistle. In the first Place, he encourages and protects a Renegado against his Patriarch; then obliges the injur'd Patriarch, under whose Subjection the Suffragan-Bishops of the Archbishoprick of *Tyre* were, to exhort these Suffragans to be obedient to their Metropolitan *Fulcher*. These are the most irregular and uncanonical Breaches of Discipline that any Ecclesiastick Governor can be guilty of; and yet at last, to smooth up all, and give a Colour to these Actions, pretends to pray for Right and Order in the Church. *ib p.* 950. This Pope's Eighth and Ninth Epistles are the two vilest Pieces of Cant imaginable, considering that at the same Time that he preaches up Unanimity and Peace to *Gerard*, *Baldwin*, *Bernard*, and other of the Suffragan-Bishops of *Tyre*, he himself is guilty of the Breach of both in a most scandalous Manner; first, in assuming a Title of Dominion over *Jerusalem*, and other Eastern Churches, which he nor his Predecessors ever had any Right to; and next, in as unjustly prosecuting it as he had assum'd it, by claiming the Obedience of those who were always before allow'd to be his Equals.

The rest of this Pope's Epistles are of the same Texture, all of them claiming Sovereignty over Foreign Churches and Monasteries, nay and over

Kings too; witness the Ninth Epistle (*Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 951.) of this Pope to *Roger* King of *Sicily*, wherein he pretends to confirm the Title of King of *Sicily*, Duke of *Apulia*, and Prince of *Capua*, before bestow'd on him by Pope *Honorius*; obliging him to be dutiful and observant of Mother Church, and not to fail of the yearly Tribute which he was to pay. His Epistles to the Kings of *Denmark* and *Sweden*, and, in short, all the rest of them, are but so many distinct Claims of Dominion over the Persons to whom he writes; so that these Epistles are inserted for no other Reason (whether they be genuine or not is not the Point) than to assert the Universal Supremacy both in Church and State; and upon Occasion, tho' apparent Forgeries, shall serve for authentick Proof.

Before we take Leave of this Pope, I must add one Passage relating to *Ralph* Patriarch of *Antioch*, whom we lately mentioned. The Editors, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1026. out of *William* of *Tyre*, tell a Story very little to the Reputation of the Bishop of *Rome*; nor can I see what End it can answer, except to shew the absolute Sovereignty which they pretend was always inherent to St. *Peter*'s Chair. "*Alberic* Archbishop of *Ostia*, as Pontifical Legate, presided in the Council of *Antioch*, *A. D.* 1142. at which, among others, *Fulcher* Archbishop of *Tyre*, a devout Creature of the Pope's, and, upon whom for the Consummation of the Business, Legate *Alberic* solely depended, was present; who, *the more to strengthen the Interest of his Party*, brought with him his two Suffragans, *Baldvin* Bishop of *Berytus*, and *Bernard* Bishop of *Sidon*. The Council being sat, the Pope's Commission is read, and the Accusers appear, two of which were *Arnulf* and *Lambert* the Archdeacons, who,

" besides other Favours, had been lately restor'd " to his Benefice by the Patriarch; notwithstan- " ding which, he ungratefully turns Evidence " against him" Another Evidence against the Patriarch, was *Serlo* Archbishop of *Apamea*: This *Serlo* is not number'd among the Evidence at first, but only drops as it were by Chance from the Editors in these Words of *Tyrius, ib. p.* 1027. " Whilst " these Things were transacting, *Serlo* Archbishop " of *Apamea* is by the Legate observ'd to sit in " the Council without his Pontifical Habit, who " asks him, Why he differ'd thus from the rest of his " Brethren; and, *why he did not proceed in his Accu-* " *sation as he had begun?* These are literally the " Words of *Tyrius*. To which the Archbishop " answers, What I have done, was inconsiderate " Heat and Rashness, and against the Interest of " my own Soul, detracting from my Holy Father, " and, like cursed *Cham*, exposing my Father's " Nakedness; but now, by the Grace of God, I " am recovered from my Error; and am so far " from presumptuously accusing or judging him, " that I am ready to lay my Life down for his " Sake. Upon this, *Serlo* is commanded to depart " the Council, and the Sentences of Excommuni- " cation and Degradation being pronounc'd against " him, he is, right or wrong, [*sive juste, sive aliter*] " deposed from his Sacerdotal and Pontifical Fun- " ction, and retiring to his Diocess, soon bid adieu " to the World." This is horrid, but the worst Part of the Story is to come: They go on, and would seem to lay the Odium on the Prince of the Place; but let him be as wicked as can be suppos'd, the Pope's Legate went Hand in Hand with him, nay was directly his Tool and Executioner. " So " great a Dread, says *Tyrius*, *ibid.* of the Prince, " who was too much of the Legate's Party, had

" possess'd them all, that no Body dare contradict " any Thing that was said." But to return to the Accusation of the Patriarch of *Antioch*: " The " Crimes laid to his Charge were irregular and " uncanonical entering on his Patriarchate, Incon- " tinence, and Simony." These are Crimes of a high Nature, and such as required a most exact Scrutiny; but none of them, according to the Editors Author *Tyrius*, were prov'd. Nay, they invalidate their own Story; or, at least, make their Author do it himself: For of the two first Accusers, *viz. Arnulf* and *Lambert*, he fixes an infamous Stigma on the last, by calling him ungrateful for accusing the Patriarch; which no honest Man could have done, if the Patriarch had been guilty of the Crimes charged on him; for his Conviction would have wip'd off the Stain of Ingratitude from *Lambert*. But the Patriarch's Innocence appears more in the Behaviour of Archbishop *Serlo* than any Thing else. It's certain *Serlo* was sensibly convinc'd he had wrong'd the Patriarch, by his charging himself with inconsiderate Temerity in scandalously accusing him, indangering thereby his own Soul; and at the same Time in the most pungent Sorrow reproaches himself with cursed *Cham*'s Character, for discovering his Father's Nakedness; offering by Way of Attonement, to lay down his Life for his Sake. This is so convincing a Circumstance in Favour of the Patriarch's Innocence, that they who will condemn him must make *Serlo* a mad Man. And it is plain he at last acted with the Deliberation of a sober Man, being sensible that God's Grace had recover'd him from a dangerous Error; and his severe Contrition and Regret for his past Injustice, plainly demonstrates the Sincerity of his Repentance.

The

The Legate's Business in this Council was to maintain the Universality of his Master; and therefore he must side with those that support that Topick: But in promoting that, Ambition so blinded him, that he had not the left Regard either to his own Integrity, or the Character he bore; otherwise he would never have consented to be made a Tool to promote the vilest Action in the World. " *Petrus Armoinus*, says *Tyrius*, *ibid.* " *p.* 1028. a very wicked Man, and Governor of " the City, had a great Influence over the Prince, " a Man very unwary and indiscreet. This *Petrus* " *Armoinus* therefore thought with himself, if the " Patriarch were deposed, he might through his " Interest with the Prince get his Nephew *Haymeric* promoted to the Patriarchal See, whom not " long before the Patriarch had imprudently made " Dean of that Church: Which was accordingly " done." So that here it is plain, the Legate was the Property in promoting the Purposes of these Men; which he did in a most infamous Manner, and vastly different from the Character of a Clergyman. The poor Patriarch, without Doubt, was appriz'd of the Designs against him; for after three Summons to appear, he refused. " Whether his " own Conscience struck him, says *Tyrius*, *ibid.* or " whether fearing the Prejudice of the Synod, " which was pack'd against him, and the Malice " of the Prince, we cannot say; but he, as before, " refus'd the Third Time to come. He remain'd " in his Palace, being accompanied with a great " Number of Horse and Foot, who came from all " Parts of the City to his Relief; and, had it not " been for the mighty Power of the Prince, the " Legate, and all those that join'd with him in the " Patriarch's Deposition, had with Shame been " forc'd to fly the City. The Legate, seeing the

"Patriarch would not come to him, being supported "by the Power and Interest of the Prince, advances "to the Patriarch's Palace, where delivering the "Sentence of Deposition against him, he by Force "compell'd him to surrender his Ring and Cross; "and then, at the Command of the same Legate, "he is deliver'd up to the Prince, who, like a Man "of Blood, causes him to be put in Irons, and "treated most ignominiously, being imprison'd in "the Monastery of St. *Simeon*, on the Top of a "high Hill near the Sea; whence, after a long "Confinement, he escap'd, and went to *Rome*; "where having received some small Favour from "the Apostolick See, as he was preparing to re-"turn, he was by some Body poison'd; but by "whom not known." Here was a Concatenation of Wickedness; a Set of vile Men wanted to put a specious Face upon a wicked Design, to make it look plausible in the Eye of the World, and they found one ready for their Purpose in the Person of the Pope's Legate; nothing less than the Authority of the Apostolick See must grace their Pretensions. A seeming legal Synod call'd, though compos'd of pack'd Creatures, a Legate presiding in this Synod wholely at the Devotion of the Prince, which Prince is influenc'd and manag'd by a profligate Wretch that govern'd the City. A hopeful Prospect of just and regular Proceedings in such a Synod! One of the Accusers stigmatiz'd with ill Fame; another recants, and deserts so wicked a Cause, for which he is excommunicated and depos'd, right or wrong, and soon after dies of Grief. The impatient Legate, tired with the Slowness of three Days Proceeding, with an arm'd Force attacks the Patriarch's Palace, executes the Sentence of Deposition on him in Person, by compelling him to deliver up his Ring and Cross, the Ensigns of

of his Patriarchate, and then delivers him up to the Secular Prince, who treated him with the utmost Inhumanity. The Character which *Tyrius* gives this Patriarch is very strange, being a Compound of Good and Evil; and which we have good Reason to believe, because *Tyrius* says, when he was young he himself had seen him. "He was, says "he, a Man of a comely Person, tolerably learned, of an eloquent and pleasant Speech, very "graceful and liberal, a great Lover of Military "Men, unmindful of his Promise, subtile and inconstant, yet provident and discreet; and most "imprudent in this, that he would not be reconcil'd to those whom he had justly made his Enemies; very arrogant, and conceited of himself, "from which Presumption proceeded all his Misfortunes." But granting all this, there is nothing in this Character, or if it were much worse, that can justify these Irregularities against him. The worst of Men have a Right to Justice equal with the most vertuous and innocent, and therefore this Character of the Patriarch out of *Tyrius* does no Way diminish the Injustice of his Prosecuters; but besides, as *Tyrius* tells the whole Story, he makes the Synod that condemn'd the Patriarch a pack'd Company, exposes the Legate as over-officious, and impatient in prosecuting so vehemently; and, which is the worst Part of all, plainly makes the Pope's Legate the Tool and Property throughout the whole Proceeding. All this Noise, and the Design of the whole Transaction, was for nothing but to remove the Patriarch, to make Way for the Governor's Nephew, which was accordingly done, and the Legate the main Agent in it. Had the Patriarch been a Man of Penetration, after such foul and inhumane Treatment as he had met with in his own Territories from the Apostolick

lick Legate, he could not expect much better at *Rome*; and therefore of all Places in the World, after he had escap'd out of Prison, *Rome* should have been the last Place of his Retirement. However, he unwarily went thither, where he pays for his Presumption with the Loss of his Life; one Draught of Poison, from no Body knows whom, putting an End to all Animosities; but not to the indelible Stain which such irregular and unjust Proceedings must contract in the Opinion of impartial Judges. But how uncanonical soever these Doings were, the main Point was gain'd, *viz.* The Supremacy of the Patriarch of *Rome* was establish'd in the West, where he by his Legates acts as Arbitrarily as a Monarch circumscrib'd within no Laws or Bounds; and it must be for this End only that they tell this Story, which otherwise would much detract from the Character of a Bishop of the First See.

There were Six several Councils held at *Constantinople*, from the Year 1140 to 1168, all of them called upon very dangerous and flagrant Heresies, none of which are mentioned by the Editors; and tho' the Bishop of *Rome* was no more concern'd in them, than his Predecessors formerly had been in several others; yet, being called upon such extraordinary Occasions, it is a Wonder they are not inserted, as usually, tho' with only this, That these Councils were held in such a Pope's Time, though they knew nothing of them. But whatever the Occasion was, they are left out by the Editors; tho' they were called to extirpate such dangerous Heresies, as that condemn'd in the First *Constantinopolitan* Council of this Century, which was *A. D.* 1140, in the Pontificate of *Innocent* II. against *Constantine Chrysomalus*'s Writings, which maintain'd several heterodox and strange Principles; *viz.* That they

they who paid any Honour or Veneration to any Prince, paid Adoration to the Devil: That all Christians had two Souls, the one susceptible of Sin, the other not; and that if he had but one Soul, he could not be a Christian, *&c.*

The Second *Constantinopolitan* Council was in the Year 1143, in the Pontificate of Pope *Celestine*, against a most abominable monstrous Set of Heretics, called *Bogomilions*, from *Bogomilus* the Monk, their Founder. This Heresy was a Medley of Manicheism and Massalianism, and consisted of most absurd Opinions. They despis'd Christian Theology, and all Doctrine concerning the Oeconomy of Christ: They called Churches the Temples of Devils, and held the Eucharistical Sacrifice in the highest Disdain: They allow'd no Secular Person, except he became a Monk, to be sav'd, tho' ever so vertuous: That Men might undertake the Sacred Tonsure without the Consent of their Wives, and Women without the Consent of their Husbands: That all Christian Relicks within and without Churches ought to be destroy'd. In short, they were for rooting up all Canonical Order and Discipline, not sticking at the Anathematization of our Blessed Saviour.

The Third *Constantinopolitan* Council, *A. D.* 1144, was held by the same Patriarch, and much upon the same Occasion, against one *Nipho*, a Monk, and Ringleader of the *Bogomilian* Sect; whom the Fathers of this Council silenc'd for a Time; but he soon broke loose again, as appears by

The Fourth *Constantinopolitan* Council, which was held upon this Occasion, *A. D.* 1147. *Cosmas Atticus*, lately made Patriarch, was so fond of *Nipho* the Monk and Heretick abovesaid, that tho' he knew he was synodically condemn'd, and that it was no less Punishment than Excommunication to

con-

converſe with him, yet admitted him into his Company, contracted a ſtrict Friendſhip with him, and taxes the Decrees made againſt him with Injuſtice. *Nipho* upon this grows very inſolent, with Security and Impunity daily ſpreading his Doctrine, and utterly denying and diſowning the God of the *Hebrews*, as he call'd him. *Coſmas* was cautioned by his Friends not to incourage ſo infamous a Wretch; but he the more obſtinately perſiſts, and ſets a greater Value on the Man; inſomuch that when the Emperor ſent to demand this Heretick to be brought to Juſtice, *Coſmas* oppoſed the Officers, endeavouring to reſcue him from them; which when he could not do, he deſir'd he might be committed to Priſon with him. Upon this, the common People growing tumultuous, a Synod forthwith is aſſembled, in which the Emperor *Manuel Comnenus* preſides. Before whom *Coſmas* being ſummon'd, he openly declares he could not look upon *Nipho* as a Heretick, but eſteem'd him an Orthodox Man. For this, he is by Vote of the Synod condemn'd, and according to the Tenor of the Decree, ſubſcrib'd by One and thirty Metropolitans, is depoſed, as being unworthy of the Patriarchal Dignity. Here was a dangerous Concatenation of Miſchief in theſe Hereſies; and certainly it highly behov'd ſome Body to be active in preventing the Growth of them; and if the Biſhops of *Rome* had had any Claim of Right to the Univerſality they before and ſince have pretended to, here was a glorious Opportunity of exerting it, when ſo great a Part of the Eaſtern Church, as that of *Conſtantinople* was, in Danger of being infected, if not totally poiſon'd, with ſo fatal a Hereſy; and no leſs a Perſon the Fomenter and Encourager of this Hereſy, than a Patriarch. And yet we do not find that the Biſhop of *Rome* was concern'd in it, or ſo much as conſulted in it, having

having no Legate to represent him in the Synod; but the Emperor himself in Person presided, One and thirty Metropolitans assisting him, besides a great Number of Princes, Senators and Judges.

The Fifth Council of *Constantinople*, *A. D.* 1166, was upon an Occasion inferior to the former; for it was only upon Suspicion of Heresy, the Fact not being prov'd. At this Council there were Three Patriarchs, *Luke* of *Constantinople*, *Athanasius* of *Antioch*, and *Nicephorus* of *Jerusalem*; and Fifty seven Metropolitans, besides Princes and other illustrious Persons. In this reverend and noble Assembly, the *Almarins* were accus'd of False Opinions of the Divine Nature by *Demetrius* of *Lampia*, *John* of *Corcyra*, *Constantine* of *Bulgaria*, and *John* of *Irene*, Bishops. The Cause had been protracted for Six Years, and at length was determined here; where the Accusation being prov'd false, the Accusers were depriv'd of their Dignities, and banish'd. Notwithstanding this Case was so general, and the Assembly consisted of so many illustrious Persons both in Church and State, yet there is no Mention made of the Bishop of *Rome*, either by himself or Legate. Nor is it to be suppos'd, that Cases of so high Concern as these Heresies were, could be transacting so many Years, *viz.* from *A. D.* 1140, to 1168, without the Knowledge of the Patriarch of the Western Church; tho' we do not find any Cognizance taken of them till

The Sixth and last *Constantinopolitan* Council of this Century, which was *A. D.* 1168, and that by none of the Editors. The Bishop of *Rome* indeed, as has been observ'd, seldom slip'd any Opportunity, when Councils were held by the Eastern Church, of sending his Legates, and making large Demands. But by the Occasion of this Council, which was to procure Reconciliation and Peace between the

Eastern

Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches, it's plain they had been at long Variance. Notwithſtanding ſeveral Cardinals and Biſhops were ſent on this Purpoſe, yet none of them pretended on the Pope's Behalf to preſide here; but *Michael Anchialis*, the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, preſided. The Demands of the Cardinals and other Weſtern Biſhops were, That the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould be acknowledg'd by the *Greek* Church to be Supreme Biſhop; That they ſhould commemorate him in their Divine Offices; and, That Appeals to him ſhould be allow'd.

It was the moſt unreaſonable Demand that the Creatures of the Pontificate could make, to have their Biſhop commemorated in their Divine Offices. This was a transferring their Canonical Obedience from their own Patriarch to another, and a direct dethroning of him. It was a particular Injunction, That every Patriarch in his own Diſtrict ſhould be commemorated; a particular Inſtance of which we have in St. *Chryſoſtome*, whilſt he adorn'd the Patriarchal See of *Conſtantinople*. To recognize another Patriarch therefore inſtead of their own, had been a direct dethroning him.

Theſe were unlikely Terms of Reconciliation; and the *Greeks* ſo deſpis'd the Conditions, that the Emperor, Synod and Senate decreed, That the Pope, and all his Adherents, ſhould be cut off from them by a total Separation. The Editors, as I have before mentioned, take no Notice of theſe Things; and we are beholden only to *L. Allatius* for the Account of them. *De Conſen. Orient. & Occident. l.* 11. *c.* 12. *n.* 1. *col.* 664.

I beg Pardon for this Digreſſion from the Series of Time, but the Concatenation of the Matter lead me to it.

[1143.] The

[1143.] The next that ascends the Pontifical Chair is *Guido de Castello*, under the Name of Pope *Celestine* II. He was first Priest-Cardinal of the Church of *Rome*, under the Title of St. *Mark*, and in the Year 1140, was sent Legate into *France* by Pope *Innocent* II. where, for his favourable Inclinations to *Arnald* of *Brescia*, the Heretick, he was severely reprimanded by St. *Bernard*, as appears in his 188th Epistle. This *Arnald* was formerly a Disciple of *Abaelard*, an excellent Philosopher, but a Monster in Point of Religion; whom St. *Bernard* aforesaid ingeniously describes: " When he " speaks of the Trinity, he is an *Arian*; when he " talks of Grace, he is a *Pelagian*; and as to the " Person of Christ, he is a *Nestorian*." This was a wretched Composition of Blasphemy and Heresy; and yet, as vile as it was, the Owner and Professor of these Tenets was protected and follow'd by the Princes of the Church; (for such the Cardinals now began to be.) This the same St. *Bernard*, in his 187th, 188th, 189th, 192d, and other Epistles, makes pretty clear; who having acquainted Pope *Innocent* II. with every Thing relating to this Heretick, expected Sentence against him from *Rome*; which by *Bernard*'s Impatience seem'd to be delay'd; for he having in the Council of *Sens* confuted *Abaelard*, wrote to the Pope, but at last sent his Letters to him by the Archbishop of *Rhemes*, and other Bishops, about the same Argument. He wrote likewise to several Cardinals of the *Roman* Church, and particularly to *Guido de Castello*, afterwards Pope *Celestine* II. to caution him, that he should not for the Sake of ancient Friendship protect *Abaelard*. He wrote likewise, says the same St. *Bernard*, to *Ivo* Cardinal of the Church of *Rome*, and when he had mentioned several of his Heresies, he adds, " That the said *Abaelard* and his

" Works

" Works had been before condemn'd by the Apo-
" ſtolick Legate; nevertheleſs he accounted him-
" ſelf ſecure, he ſaid, as having the Cardinals and
" Clergy of the Church of *Rome* his Diſciples.
Lab. T. 10. *p.* 1020, 1021. It's certain, that without ſome Countenance and Favour from one, or ſome Body of great Men, after Condemnation, he durſt not have openly profeſs'd his Hereſies; and had it not been for ſo active and good a Man as St. *Bernard*, who too plainly perceiv'd the Infallible Judge and his College of Cardinals to be ting'd with this Heretick's Principles, *Abaelard* might have gone on much longer without Interruption. *Otho. Friſing*, *l.* 1: *c.* 48, 49. puts this in a yet clearer Light; and being a Cotemporary with theſe Tranſactions, was capable of giving a truer Account, and therefore more to be credited. " After theſe
" Things, ſays he, when *Abaelard* again had for ma-
" ny Days read to the People, and drawn a migh-
" ty Concourſe together, *Innocent* II. then being
" Pope at *Rome*, and *Lewis* the Son reigning in
" *France*, he is ſummon'd to *Sens* by the Biſhops
" and Abbot *Bernard*, where in the Preſence of the
" King, Count Palatine, Nobility, *&c.* he is que-
" ſtioned, and his Faith examin'd. But he fearing
" ſome Inſult from the People, appeals to *Rome*;
" upon which the Biſhops and the Abbot wrote a
" Remonſtrance to the Pope, acquainting him
" with their Proceeding, and the Sentence of Con-
" demnation." Which the Pope ſoon after confirm'd; and being put in Execution, *Abaelard*'s Books were burnt, and he retir'd to the Monaſtry of *Cluny*, where he wrote an Apologetick. Here was a Knot of dangerous Hereſies repullulating in the Church, and ſuch as once had almoſt overturn'd Chriſtianity; and yet, as vile as they were, it's plain from the Authors in thoſe Times, the College

lege of Cardinals were ſhrewdly ſuſpected, if not really guilty of them; otherwiſe the honeſt Abbot St. *Bernard* need not have given himſelf the Trouble of Writing to them, nor had *Abaelard* appealed from the Council of *Sens* (where St. *Bernard* ſo warmly engag'd him, even to Confutation) to the Apoſtolick See, but that he had Hopes of better Quarter than the honeſt Abbot gave him; and conſidering how dilatory the Pope had been in this Caſe, that St. *Bernard* was forc'd to write by the Archbiſhop of *Rhemes* and others Biſhops, I do not ſee but that *Abaelard* might have gone on: Only St. *Bernard* ferreted him, would not let him reſt, till he had either reclaim'd him, or brought him to Juſtice. This was a neceſſary Digreſſion, becauſe it is a Diſcovery of the Principles of Pope *Celeſtine* II. before he was advanc'd to the Pontifical Throne, and therefore I hope will be more readily excus'd.

The Editors begin the Life of Pope *Celeſtine* II. with a very inauſpicious Blunder, to prove an Innovation. They ſay this Pope, according to a Conſtitution of his Predeceſſor *Innocent* II. in which the People were forbid to meddle in the Election of a Pope, was the firſt that was choſen without the Suffrages of the People. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1030. The Reaſon of this is plain from themſelves, *ibid.* for the College of Cardinals having grown from a minute Beginning to a Temporal Principality, the *Roman* Senate was laid aſide; and therefore, out of *Onuphrius*, the Editors ſay, the *Romans* attempting to reſtore the Senate to their ancient Rights, this Pope was choſen without the Votes of the People. He himſelf, in his Epiſtle to the Monks of *Cluny*, ſpeaks plainer, and ſays, *ib. p.* 1031. " The Cardinal-Prieſts and Deacons choſe him, " together with the Brethren the Biſhops and Sub-

" deacons,

"deacons, the Clergy and People making great "Acclamation." So that it is plain on all Hands, *Celeſtine* II. was choſen without the People. But whence the Editors had this Conſtitution, or where it is, they would do well to let us know. There is nothing of it mentioned in the Epiſtles of Pope *Innocent* II. nothing in the Account they give us of the Councils, or in any Canon of them, during his Pontificate. To ſay therefore, that an Election was made according to Canon or Conſtitution, and produce no ſuch, nor direct where it is to be found, is the worſt Sort of Forgery; and but too apparently ſhews, That when they are ſtrong enough to carry their Point by Force, they never want a Pretence or Authority to juſtify their Innovations.

The good old Abbot *Bernard*, who never before had been ſparing of his good Advice to Pope *Innocent* II. and his Cardinals, when he thought or ſaw them in Danger, could not let Pope *Celeſtine* II. paſs without an Admonition, when he ſaw him committing an irregular Action. There was one *William*, Treaſurer of the Church of *York*, (a Man of very wicked Morals, whom Pope *Innocent* had condemn'd and baniſh'd) that was ſurreptitiouſly obtruded on the See of *York*, and by this Pope *Celeſtine* II. ordained and conſecrated. The good old Abbot complains of this to the Pope himſelf, and taxes him with Irregularity: But he might as well have been ſilent, for his Holineſs's Infallibility knew better than to be corrected by an Abbot.

[1144.] Pope *Lucius* II. ſucceeds, who before was called *Gerard*. He was a great Favourite of Pope *Honorius* II. by whom he was made Cardinal-Prieſt, with the Title of S. Croſs of *Jeruſalem*, and Librarian of the Church of *Rome*; and of *Innocent* II. who made him Chancellor of the Apo-

ſtolick

ſtolick See, and Governor of the City of *Beneventum*; which, like a true militant Prieſt, he bravely defended againſt *Roger* King of *Sicily*. He was, in Imitation of his Predeceſſor *Celeſtine* II. choſen without the Conſent of the People; and, to perpetuate this Cuſtom, (for which the Editors ſhew no Authority) he, ſay they, like a prudent and reſolute Man, by the Advice of the Friends of the Church, compell'd thoſe Senators, who, contrary to the Prohibition, of his Predeceſſor Pope *Innocent* II. had aſcended the Capitol, (*i. e.* in order to the Election of the Pope) to abjure the Senate. This was carrying Things with a high Hand indeed; and not only made his Reign uneaſy, but ſhorten'd his Life, according to *Baronius*, who ſays, that as he was endeavouring to drive the ſeditious *Romans* out of the Capitol, he was ſtruck with a Stone from an unknown Hand, of which Hurt he died. His Epiſtle to the Emperor *Conrad* is written in a different Style to what his Predeceſſors us'd. No bullying and domineering, but the moſt abject ſupplicating for Help. Indeed, the *Romans* us'd him very coarſly; for they ſtripp'd him of his *Regalia*, as well within the City, as without, ſubjecting him wholly to the Patrician, whom they had ſet over the Senators, allowing him no more than the Tythes and Oblations for his Maintenance. Upon the Death of Pope *Lucius* II,

[1145.] *Bernard* mounts the Papal Throne by the Name of *Eugene* III. whoſe Election being diſapprov'd of by the *Romans*, eſpecially that Part of them call'd *Arnaldiſts*, he was forced to fly the City. The Editors indeed do not ſay he was choſen by the Cardinals; but it is certain he was not choſen with Conſent of the People, becauſe they tell us the *Romans* in general were enrag'd at his Election; who being grown weary of the Pontifical Empire, endeavour'd to recover the Idea of their

ancient *Roman* Liberty, and set up one *Jordan* for Patrician, to whom they compell'd the Nobility to submit. The Confusion of these Times is well describ'd by *Cabbasutius, Eccles. Not. p.* 408. to which I refer the Reader: During which, whilst Pope *Eugene* III. was at *Viterbium*, the Editors, out of *Otho Frising.* tell a Story very much to the Advantage of their belov'd Supremacy, to those that can believe it. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1043. The Place they cite, is *Otto. Chron. L.* 7. *cap.* 32. " Whilst Pope " *Eugene* was at *Viterbium*, the Legates of the *Ar-* " *menian* Bishops, and their Metropolitan, whom " they call *Catholick*, that is, Universal, as having " above a Thousand Bishops under him, came from " the furthest Part of the East to him, offering " Subjection to him on Behalf of their Church. This Subjection, we are to observe, was paid to the *Roman* Pontiff over and above the Errand these Legates came about; for the subsequent Words tell the Occasion of this long Journey from the furthest Parts of the East to *Rome*. " The *Armenians* and " the *Greeks* in some Things concerning the Rites " of the Sacrifice agree, in others they differ: " They both use the Bread alive; but the *Arme-* " *nians* do not mix Water with the Wine, as the " *Greeks* and we do. Thus differing in these and " other Things, they chose the *Roman* Church " their Judge, desiring to have her Form of Sacri- " fice, according to Custom, delivered to them. " The Bishop of *Rome* receives them kindly, ad- " mits them to the Solemnity of the Mass, and " the Secrets of the Sacrifice; advising them dili- " gently to observe what was transacted at the " same Time: Which whilst they were doing, as " they stood devoutly by the Holy Altar, one of " them, who was a Bishop, (as he himself after- " wards declared in a full Assembly) whilst the

" Pope

" Pope was performing the Sacred Mysteries, saw " the Sun-Beams in a most splendid Manner glister " about his Head, and Two Doves lighting on his " Head; and when he had strictly look'd about to " see whence that Light should come, and could " no Way discover the Place of its Entrance, he " look'd upon this as the Work of God; and be- " ing now more desirous to acknowledge Obe- " dience to the Church of *Rome*, he discovered " what he had seen to all.

" We saw likewise (says the same Author) at " that Place the Bishop of *Gabula* from *Syria*, (by " whose Means *Antioch* began to submit to the See " of *Rome*) complaining of the Patriarch of *An-* " *tioch*, and the Daughter of *Baldwin* formerly " King of *Jerusalem*; and also demanding the " Tythe of the Spoils taken from the *Saracens*, " after the Example of *Abraham* exacting the same " from *Melchisedech*.

These are Stories transcending Belief, and fit for none but the most benumm'd Biggots: And tho' *Otho*, as the Editors cite him, affirms he saw these Passages, I cannot readily credit them for these Reasons:

1. Here are Legates which come from one *Universal* Bishop to another; and this Metropolitan, from whom the Legates came, was numerically call'd *Universal*, from the vast Number of Bishops within his District, above a Thousand, says the Author. I must confess, the Number is large, and such as, I dare venture to affirm, at that Time scarce any Metropolitan besides himself could claim. But that which is most shocking, is, these Legates came from *almost the furthest Parts of the East*. Now if the Metropolitan of *Armenia*'s Province reach'd so far as *almost the furthest Parts of the East*, it exceeded the Extent of the Patriarchates of those

Days, and interfered very much with those of *Antioch* and *Jerusalem*; to one of which, it is highly probable, *Armenia* was subject. But this is still to magnify the *Roman* Supremacy, which they will have to stretch from one End of the World to the other; though it is as insignificant in many Places as it is in *China* or *Japan*. Besides, though the Author says, the Legates came but from *almost the furthest Parts of the East*; yet it was so far, that, *ibid.* he says, they were a Year and a half a coming; which, at a very moderate Way of travelling, and by the most modest Computation, must be some Thousands of Miles: The Truth of which I cannot but question, for Christianity at that Time of Day had less Ground far Eastward.

2. That which next seems to invalidate this Story, is, we have no Account of it in any Council, either in the Eastern or the Western Church. It ever was the Custom to debate Differences of this Nature that these Legates came about in Council; and they needed not have gone so far as *Rome* for a Determination at that Time, when *Constantinople, &c.* were nearer. Nor is it to be imagin'd, that the Bishop of *Rome*, upon gaining so advantagious a Point as the Submission of so considerable a Part of the Eastern Church to his See, would have received them without some very publick Recognition. A Council had been the proper Manner in an Affair of this Nature, or at least more Witnesses than the Transactors of the Thing; for we have only their Authority for it, who cannot be imagined to be otherwise than crack'd-brain'd, or else after so incredible Stories they would not,

3. Dare to confirm this preposterous Story with the most ridiculous Legend, and the worst put together that ever was invented. First it says, after the Pope had admitted them to the Mass, *&c.*

which

which whilst they were doing, and stood devoutly by the Holy Altar, one of them, who was a Bishop, spy'd the Coruscation of Light about the Pope's Head, and the Two Doves ascending and descending on him. This the said Bishop declared in a full Assembly, &c. So incredible a Story ought to have been back'd better than by one Witness, especially when there were more present; besides, *Otho* the Author, who was present at these Things, does put in his *Vidimus* to this Part of it, as he does to others; but only tells what another says; whereas his own Testimony had been equally good with anothers.

4. The latter Part of the Story about the Church of *Antioch* submitting to the See of *Rome*, is no more than a further Encroachment, still laying Claim to what she had no Right, and is no more to believed than that they received the Tythe of the Spoils taken from the *Saracens*; which is very unlikely at that Time, for the same Author, *ibid.* p. 1044. makes the Christians to be in such a low Condition, that they were far from taking Spoils from the *Saracens*, who gain'd considerably upon them. *Audivimus eum Periculum transmarinæ Ecclesiæ post captam Edessam lacrymabiliter conquerentem*: "We "heard him, says he, (*i. e.* the Bishop of *Gabula*) "with Tears deploring the Danger of the Church "beyond Sea, after the taking of *Edessa*.

As to the Story of *William* Treasurer of the Church of *York*, whom Pope *Innocent* II. had condemned and banished for his scandalous and immoral Life, and whom Pope *Celestine* II. thrusts afterwards into the See of *York*, Pope *Eugene* III. to preserve the Justice of the Papal Chair, condemned and banished: But the Editors spoil the Merit of the Act; for they say, *ibid. p.* 1045. that he did it at the Instance of St. *Bernard*, not of his own Accord; so that his Holiness was but the Abbot's

Instrument, and he had seen, notwithstanding his sagacious Infallibility, no more into the Demerits of *William* of *York*, than his Predecessor Pope *Celestine* II. who would not be perswaded by the same Abbot to do Justice on the Criminal.

There are Eighty three Epistles ascribed to this Pope, every one of which, like so many Champions of the Pontificate, magnify the vast Extent of Power invested in the Bishop of *Rome*. This Pope, like many or most of his Predecessors, shews a peculiar Esteem to Abbots; by cajoling of whom, and domineering over Bishops when he writes to them, it is plain he prefers them before his own Order: A great Instance of which we have in the Epistles of this Pope. When he writes to *Sugerius* Abbot of St. *Dionysius* in *France*, he expresses himself with the greatest Tenderness and Friendship; applauds every Thing he does; sets him at the Head of the Church of *Paris*, as the King had set him at the Head of the State during his Voyage to the Holy Land: His Words soft; when he obliges him to do any Thing; *commonemus*, *exhortamur*, *& rogamus*, are his usual Terms; few *Mandamus's* to him, which is the Pope's constant Words when he writes to any Archbishop or Bishop.

The old Pique against the Church of *Ravenna* (which we have before mention'd) is revived by Pope *Eugene* III. who, after the Manner of his Predecessors, lops off as much of her Power as he could conveniently come at. In his Sixty fifth Epistle to *Moses* Archbishop of *Ravenna*, he tells him, that, *salvo suo Jure*, he had, by Vertue of his Apostolick Authority, confirmed the Election of the Bishop of *Placentia*; and yet, in the Sixty sixth Epistle, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1087. he strips the Church of *Ravenna* of all Power in this Case, by investing himself and his Successors with the sole Power of conse-

consecrating the Bishop of *Placentia*: And this he does with a *salvo Jure Ravennatis Ecclesiæ*; yet toward the End of this Epistle he says: "That by "the Advice of his Brethren he had resolved, "that the Bishop Elect of *Placentia* and his Succes-"sors should receive their Consecration without "Contradiction from the Archbishop of *Ravenna*, "and his Successors, as their Metropolitans, and "pay Canonical Obedience and Reverence to "them as such." But cuts off all again at last with *salva in omnibus Apostolicæ Sedis Autoritate*; which no Doubt he would take more Care to observe for himself, than he had done for the Archbishop of *Ravenna*. But all this proceeded from the old Grudge: *Rome* look'd upon *Ravenna* as a dangerous Neighbour, if not Rival: She had often given Check to the exorbitant Power of the Apostolick See: And though, as has been observed, the Bishops of *Rome* had divested her of several Cities, and brought her very low, yet *Rome* still had an evil Eye upon her, and either saw or fancied something which might make her apprehensive of Danger from that Quarter, and therefore endeavours to disable her from doing any further Disservice.

There is one Thing very remarkable among these Epistles of Pope *Eugene* III. and that is the Growth of Cardinals, who were arrived to the Number of Twenty two, at least, so many subscribing to Pope *Eugene*'s Ninth Epistle, which he wrote to the Canons of St. *Peter* at *Rome*.

[1153.] *Anastasius* IV. before call'd *Conrad*, succeeds Pope *Eugene* III. of whom the Editors say but little; for he sate but a Year and Four Months; only this, that he was well vers'd in the Affairs of the Court of *Rome*. After which short Enjoyment of the Papacy, he made Way for

[1154.] *Adrian* IV. an *English* Man, formerly

call'd *Nicolas Breakspear*, born at *Langly* near St. *Alban's* in *Hertfordshire*, and was the Son of one *Robert* a Monk and Priest, notwithstanding the Vows of Celibacy and Prohibition against Marriage and Concubinage in those Days. Being grown up, he had a Desire to be enter'd in the Monastery of St. *Alban's*; but *Richard* the Abbot, for what Reasons is not known, refused him. Being disappointed here, he went to *Paris* and for some Time studied there. Afterwards being admitted in the Monastery of St. *Rufus* near *Valentia*, he soon became Prior, and afterwards Abbot. Going to *Rome* about the Affairs of the Monastery, he was by Pope *Eugene* III. made Cardinal and Bishop of St. *Alban's*. He was a strenuous Champion, and a faithful Creature of the Pontificate; of whose Rights, both before and after he was Pope, he was an irrefragable Asserter. The Editors give him a short and yet ample Character out of the *Vatican* MSS. calling him, "a Man of a sweet and "gentle Disposition, well skill'd in the *Greek* and "*Latin* Tongues, an elegant and fluent Preacher, "his Voice of a sweet Tone or Accent, slow to "Anger, swift to forgive, a chearful and charita-"ble Giver, and enrich'd with all Virtues and "Morals." This is a most ample Character indeed; and undoubtedly his Abilities were great, or he had not been employed in such considerable and difficult Embassies; as particularly that in *Norway* and *Denmark*, where he propagated the Christian Faith amongst a barbarous People, and settled an Archiepiscopal Seat in the Church of *Upsal*. The first Thing after he came to be Pope, was to quell that dangerous Sect of People call'd *Arnoldists*; which he effectually did, by executing their Leader *Arnold*, Bishop of *Brescia*, on a Cross, and afterwards burning his Body to Ashes, and throwing them

them into the *Tyber*, to prevent any superstitious Adoration of his Body by the People. There is one Thing to be observed in the Editors: They are seldom sparing of a good Character of their Popes, if they be but Men of tolerable Virtue and Capacity; and therefore we are not to expect any Account of their Errors from them. But their Epistles very often shew Blots, that, notwithstanding all their Art and Cunning, they cannot conceal; though sometimes the Dates of them, or the Want of Dates, make the Matter somewhat obscure. This Pope, in the Year 1155, having quieted the *Arnoldists*, excommunicated *William* King of *Sicily* for wasting the Country of *Campania*; who, the Year following, shut up his Holiness in *Beneventum*, where he closely besieged him, and compell'd him to accept of very hard and scandalous Terms of Peace. To this the Editors, in this Pope's Life, give a quite different Turn. But Pope *Adrian*'s Eighth Epistle to *William* King of *Sicily* sets the Matter in a true Light; for it confirms the Title of the Kingdom on him, and all other Privileges extorted from the Pope through Force or Fear; which indeed do too often prevail with timerous Minds. But setting aside the Concession of Title and Privileges, the Epistle is one of the most fulsome Pieces of Flattery I ever saw. The Editors indeed say, that *William* of *Sicily* had seized on some Lands of the Church, because the Pope in his Letters to him had not in the Inscription call'd him King. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1141. But whatever was wanting in those Letters, he has plentifully made up in this, *ib. p.* 1151. "Tho' "we are enjoin'd by God to embrace all the Faith-"ful in the Arms of paternal Charity, and to in-"vite them to Peace and Concord; yet Kings "and Persons of high Rank lay a greater Claim

"to

" to our Love and Esteem; and we ought more
" earnestly to admonish them of the Benefit of
" Peace, because they are more capable of im-
" proving it for the Advantage of the Faithful.
" And it is plain, most dear Son in Christ, and
" glorious King of *Sicily*, that you appear eminent
" among the greatest Persons of the Age, for
" your noble Acts, Power, and Wealth: Inso-
" much that the Vigour of your Justice, by which
" you maintain the Constitution of your Domi-
" nions; the Security of Peace, which your Sub-
" jects comfortably enjoy; and the Terror which
" your Heroick Deeds have struck into the Ene-
" mies of the Name of Christ, have spread your
" Fame through all Parts of the World." This is literally the Sum of his Epistle to King *William* of *Sicily*: And yet this dear Son of the Church, this glorious King, this Champion for the Cause of Christianity, was at this very Time under Sentence of Excommunication; or, if we suppose that his Excommunication was taken off, it could not have been so long as to have merited the Character above-mentioned; for this Epistle is dated but in *June*, 1156. and it was but some time the Year before that the Pope passed the Sentence of Excommunication on him; so that he must mend very fast to deserve this Encomium, or his Holiness's Necessity must be very pressing to extort such a nauseous Piece of Flattery from him. This was a great Instance of humane Frailty; and shews, that his Infallibility was as liable to it as any Part of the mortal Man.

The same Year that this Sentence was pass'd against K. *William* of *Sicily*, the Emperor *Frederic Barbarossa* with a great Army enters *Italy*; whom the Pope meeting, he denied him the Kiss of Peace, until (good Man, to shew his Meekness and Humility!) he had made

made him perform the Office of Yeoman of the Stirrop: After which they lovingly went to *Rome*, where he receives the Imperial Crown from his Holiness's Hands; and so the Emperor returns to *Germany*. But this Sunshine is soon overclouded by an accidental Occasion. The Bishop of *London*, in his Return from *Rome* through *Germany*, was set upon and robb'd, and barbarously used, by some Ruffians. The Pope hearing of this, writes to the Emperor, aggravating the Fact in the highest Circumstances; tells the Emperor, the Sword was by God put into his Hands *for the Punishment of wicked Doers*: But that, instead of punishing them, he tells him he was said to dissemble and pass it by, and to protect the sacrilegious Ruffians. *Ib. p.* 1145. And a little further he puts the Emperor in Mind of Benefits received from the Apostolick See; of which, after having enumerated several general Ones which had been conferred on him by *Mater tua sacrosancta Romana Ecclesia*, (I will be express in the Words, because there is very material subsequent Matter concerned in them) he a little further adds; *qualiter Imperialis insigne Coronæ libentissimè conferens, benignissimo gremio suo tuæ Sublimitatis Apicem studuerit confovere. Ibid.* Which Words, I think, cannot be more plainly render'd than thus, *viz. That Mother-Church, to shew how studiously she had designed to indulge his Highness, had most willingly conferred the Imperial Crown on him.* I am the more particular in these Words, because we shall see the Editors make the Pope lay another Meaning on them. The rest of this Epistle is of the same Piece: Which Epistle, says *Cabbasutius*, p. 466. *col.* 2. and the Editors, *ib. p.* 1142. "was by the "Emperor and his corrupt Court taken in so sini-"ster a Sense, that the Legates that brought them "were forced the next Morning to be gone to

"*Rome*,

"*Rome*, without ſtopping or calling upon any Bi-
"ſhop or Abbot in their Way. Nor did the Em-
"peror delay to ſend his circular Letters to the
"Princes, States, and Biſhops of the Empire, in
"which, (ſays he) concealing the true Cauſe of
"the Pope's Embaſſy, he complains, that Pope
"*Adrian* had ſent Legates to him with Letters, ar-
"rogantly expoſtulating with and upbraiding him,
"that he had received the Empire from none but
"the Pope; declaring, that he held the Empire
"and Kingdom of God alone by the Election of
"the Princes, and that he would die before he
"would bear ſo ſcandalous a Reproach; at the
"ſame Time forbidding any of his Subjects to go
"to *Rome*." The Quarrel being brought to this Height by the deep Reſentment of the Emperor, and the ſubtile Encroachment of the Pope, the latter is forced to give his Words another Meaning, which in his Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Germany* and *Gaul* he does very expreſly, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1146. "He took thoſe Words, (*Insigne, videlicet, Corona*
"*Beneficium, tibi contulimus*): ſo ill, that he re-
"proached us, *&c.*" And, ſays *Cabbaſutius, ibid.* the Pope fearing a dangerous Schiſm, deſired his Friends to uſe the moſt mild Means they could to ſoften his Temper, and reconcile him; declaring, That by *conferring the Imperial Crown on him*, he did not mean as if the Emperor owed any feudal Acknowledgment to him, or that by conferring the Imperial Crown on him, he meant it as a Gift from himſelf, but only that he was the ceremonial Inſtrument in putting it on his Head, and conſecrating him to the Imperial Dignity. This is the Truth of the Matter: The Pope could no more be ſaid to be the Diſpoſer of the Imperial Dignity, by ſetting the Crown on the Emperor's Head, than any other Biſhop can be ſaid to give a Crown

to

to the Prince on whose Head he puts it; but, with these Gentlemen's Leave, the Words in Pope *Adrian's* Epistle to the Emperor carry a more absolute Meaning; nor is it more than what the *Roman* Pontiffs before and since have claim'd. He reproaches the Emperor with Ingratitude for past Benefits, particularly that of *Conferring the Imperial Crown on him*. The Words cannot imply the Act of Crowning, or setting the Crown on his Head; (for that of Course would have been otherwise express'd) but, by *Conferring*, here nothing can be meant but *conveying*, or *disposing*; and thus the *Servus Servorum* became *Rex Regum*. And *Cabbasutius*, *p.* 407. *col.* 1. plainly against his Will, inverts the Meaning and Sense of the Word *conferre*, by saying, You must not take *dare Coronam* and *conferre* to be the same, (*tho' they are unquestionably so*) for *conferre*, in its full Force, signifies no more than *imponere Capiti*. But in this I appeal to the Custom of all Countries, in which, I believe, without Exception, it will be allow'd, that the Person conferring is the Fountain, and consequently Disposer, of the Dignity, Honour, *&c.* disposed. I have done with this Pope, who liv'd not to see an End of the Feud which he began, but left it to his Successor, himself dying suddenly of a Squinancy, or, as some say, was choak'd with a Fly.

[1159.] His Successor *Alexander* III. before called *Roland*, was elected Pope by Three and twenty Cardinals. He was, no Doubt, a faithful Creature and Confident of Pope *Adrian's*, being sent by him on two dangerous Embassies; one to *William* King of *Sicily*, and another to the Emperor *Frederick*, in the Case of the Bishop of *London*; in the last of which he was but roughly treated. And therefore, upon the Death of Pope *Adrian*, the Emperor sets up *Octavian* in Opposition to him,

by

by the Name of *Victor* IV. by which a Schism commenc'd in the Church, which in his Time, and the two Anti-Popes his Successors, *Paschal* IV. and *Calistus* III. continued about One and twenty Years. *Alexander* III. being thus violently oppos'd, and by so powerful an Enemy as the Emperor, from whom he once narrowly escap'd with Life, finding himself in Danger at *Rome*, retires to a Place of greater Security. The Schism immediately burst into an open Flame, and thundering *Anathema's* were issued from both Sides. The Year following the Emperor calls a Council at *Pavia*, where, in a handsome Speech to the Bishops, he tells them, "That "tho' he was satisfied, by Vertue of his Imperial "Office and Dignity, he had Power to call a "Council when the Church was in Danger; (in-"stancing in the Cases of *Constantine*, *Theodosius*, "*Justinian*, and of later Days, *Charlemain* and "*Otho*) yet as to the Power of determining in "Matters of great Moment, he referr'd it to their "Prudence. Upon this the Emperor withdrew, and the Council declar'd in Favour of *Octavian*, condemning *Roland*. This Council is by the Editors inserted, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1387. but with this Note of Distinction, that being call'd by an unlawful Power, it was of no Effect; and therefore Pope *Alexander* III. who was summon'd to it, wisely declin'd appearing, alledging, That the Chief Bishop was not to be cited by the Laity; That all Men ought to submit to his Judgment; and that he was to be judg'd by none living; therefore he would not appoint a Legate to appear for him. As to the Election of *Victor* IV. according to what the Editors transcribe from *Radevicus* concerning the Acts of this Council, *ibid.* it looks fairer on *Victor's* Side than on *Alexander's*: For *Alexander* was chosen, according to the Editors, only by Three

and twenty Cardinals; which, according to the more modern Way of Electing, may look plausible; but, according to the ancient Way of chosing by Clergy and People, *Victor*'s Election was more justifiable; for he was chosen by the Clergy and People, the Chancellor (*i. e. Alexander*) being present, and not contradicting it. The Editors likewise further add more plausible Proofs in Favour of *Victor*'s Election, *ibid. p.* 1391. from the Emperor's Epistle to the Archbishop of *Saltzburg* and his Suffragans; but that which gives the greatest Confirmation of the Justice of *Victor*'s Election, is the Epistle of the Presidents of the Council of *Pavia*, sign'd by the Patriarch of *Aquileia*, and Nine Archbishops; to which *Henry* II. King of *England* by his Ambassador consented, (tho' afterwards that King was of another Mind, as will appear) as did the King of *Hungary*, the King of *Denmark*, the King of *Bohemia*, (who till this Emperor's Time was only Duke of *Bohemia*) and almost all the Princes of the *Roman* Empire, as well *Germans* as *Italians*; besides a vast Number of Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, *&c.* The Epistle of the Bishop of *Bamberg* to the Archbishop of *Saltzburg* is to the same Purpose, and so is that of the Canons of St. *Peter*'s at *Rome* to the Emperor: To obviate all which, the Editors produce only two Epistles of Pope *Alexander*'s, one to *Arnulph* Bishop of *Lisieux*, and the other to the Archbishops and Bishops of *England*; wherein, after Invectives, he chiefly insists on the Justice of his own Election, by lessening that of *Victor*'s, who, he says, was chosen but by Three of his Complices. (I suppose he means Cardinals, because the Editors, *ibid. p.* 1185, say he was chosen only by Three Cardinals; but *Alexander* by Three and twenty.) By which, I think, it cannot be supposed but that he must mean, the Majority of Cardinals carry

carry an Election from all whatsoever. The rest of the Epistle to the Bishop of *Lisieux* is just the same Story the Editors tell of *Victor* out of *Radevicus*'s Acts of the Council of *Pavia*; which is no more than throwing Dirt on each other.

In the Year 1162, Pope *Alexander* III. being by the Emperor forc'd to leave *Italy*, he retires into *France*, the old Asylum of distress'd Pontiffs, being invited thither by *Henry* II. of *England*, and *Lewis* of *France*; where in a Council he excommunicates his Rival *Victor*, and all Secular Princes who did not restrain Hereticks; and strictly forbidding all Monks and Regular Canons the Practice of Physick and the Secular Laws.

The Year following, he calls a Council at *Tourain*, in which assisted 17 Cardinals, 124 Bishops, and among them *Thomas Becket* Archbishop of *Canterbury* with his Suffragans, and 414 Abbots. In it the Acts of the Council of *Pavia* are rescinded, and Pope *Victor* and the Emperor excommunicated.

Before I proceed further; I must beg Leave to take Notice of the Council of *Nazareth*, which was held in the Year 1160, upon the Occasion of Pope *Alexander*'s sending a Legate. The King of *Jerusalem* was present at this Council; where, after it had been long debated, whether the Legate should be allow'd to enter the Holy Land, and the Bishops being divided, the King, with several Princes and Bishops, fearing lest the Church should suffer by this Division, persuaded the Council to incline to neither Party; advising, That if the Legate would come as a private Person, he might be permitted, alledging the Danger of passing a Definitive Sentence in an uncertain Affair, a Schism being commenc'd, which as yet did not apppear to all the World; and urging besides, that there was no

no Occaſion for a Legate in the Kingdom, to load the religious Houſes with Expences and Extortions. This was the King's Opinion; and his Jealouſy of the further Encroachments of the Biſhop of *Rome*, no Doubt, was juſtly grounded, as appears by his Advice to this Council to avoid any further Expence. It may, perhaps, be urged by the Friends of the Pontificate, that this was an ungrateful Return to the Supreme Biſhop, who at all Times was a ſtrenuous Promoter of proſecuting the War in the Holy Land: But certainly thoſe good Kings, whoſe Piety led them on to this Chriſtian Generoſity, did not intend, by driving out the Heathens, who prophan'd that Sacred Region, to plant a Colony for the Augmentation of the *Roman* Pontiff's Exchequer.

But notwithſtanding the King's Opinion, ſay the Editors, out of *Will. Tyrius, Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1404. *quæ licet utilior videretur*; the Party prevail'd, which was for receiving the Legate. Here they ſtop, and do not ſay, that the ſame Party agreed to ſend a congratulatory Epiſtle to Pope *Alexander* III. but ſubjoin one from *Almeric* and his Suffragans; which they in the Margin cite from *Tengnagel's veter. Monument.* the Authentickneſs of which I very much queſtion from the laſt Two Lines of it. The reſt of it is a general Recognition of Pope *Alexander's* Election, and Reprobation of *Victor*, whom with his Favourers having excommunicated, they voluntarily and unanimouſly accept of *Alexander* III. as their Temporal Lord and Spiritual Father, *in Dominum Temporalem & Patrem Spiritualem elegimus unanimiter, & voluntariè recepimus.* Certainly ſuch a Recognition in Temporals as this muſt be done very clandeſtinely, or the King of *Jeruſalem* would never have let it paſs. Nor had the Suburbicarian Region of the *Roman* Pontificate extended ſo far

Eastward, as to claim the Allegiance of a Temporal Prince's Subjects, with whom he had nothing to do. The Improbability of this with me invalidates the Authority of the whole Epistle.

The Council of *Lauden* is inserted by the Editors, *A. D.* 1161, but with the greatest Prejudice imaginable: For in the Beginning of their Account of it, they tell us, That *Otho Morena*, the Author of the *Lauden* Chronicle, (from whence they transcribe this Council) was a Favourer of the Schismatick Pope: And at the End of it they say to the same Purpose, *viz.* That this Author was in the Interest of the Antipope *Victor*, against the Catholick Pope *Alexander*. The first Thing done in this Council was the Recognition of Pope *Victor* by the Emperor, Nobility and Clergy, of both which there were great Numbers present; particularly the Patriarch of *Aquileia*, and the Archbishop of *Ravenna*. In this Council likewise were recited the Letters excusatory of the absent Kings of *Denmark*, *Norway*, *Hungary*, *Bohemia*, Six Archbishops, Twenty Bishops, many Abbots, *&c.* which contained their Acknowledgment of Pope *Victor*, and that they would stand by whatever was determin'd by him in that Council. The other Part of this Council relates to the Inquisition into the vilest Act that Men can be guilty of one towards another. The Archbishop of *Mentz* was one of the Presidents, who, according to the Editors, had subscrib'd to the Acts of the Council of *Pavia* in Behalf of Pope *Victor* IV. and not only he, as has been observed before, but Nine Archbishops more, with their Suffragans. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1394. But the *Milanese* were for Pope *Alexander* III. in whose Cause they were so sanguine, that they by some Means or other procured the Death of the Archbishop of *Mentz*: For which, in this Council, *Hu-*

bert Archbishop of *Milan*, with the Two Consuls of *Milan*, the Bishops of *Placentia* and *Brescia*, with the Consuls of both Places, and all their Accomplices, who were either actually guilty of or consented to the Murder of the Archbishop of *Mentz*, are excommunicated, and other Bishops deposed and suspended. This is a foul Story, and which the Editors, though they prejudice the Reader against the Author of the *Lauden* Chronicle, do not deny. But this Way of promoting any one to the Papacy by Murder did not begin here, many having before waded through Blood to St. *Peter's* Chair: Nor did it end here, for the same Method has too often been made use of since.

The Eighth *Lateran* Council of this Century, which was call'd by Pope *Alexander* III. is another Instance of the Bishop of *Rome's* Encroachment on the Imperial Dignity: For the Pope returning to *Rome*, *A. D.* 1167, he is forced from thence by the Emperor: But the Year following he attempts to repossess himself of *Rome*, and recovers it; where calling the foresaid Council, he not only excommunicates the Emperor, but deposes him; treats him with all the Contempt and Disrespect imaginable, calling him *German Tyrant*, Schismatick, *&c.* boasts himself *constituted by God above all Nations and Kingdoms*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1506. And, to strengthen his own Interest the more, and distress the Emperor, he absolves the *Italians*, and all others, from the Allegiance they had sworn to him; forbidding all Priests whatsoever to aid him in his Wars, or administer any Peace or Comfort to him, till he had by due Pennance reconcil'd himself. In which, say the Editors, from the Epistles LX. and others, of *John* of *Salisbury*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1450. the Pope followed the Example of his Predecessor *Gregory* VII. who used the Emperor *Henry* IV. after the same

Manner, by condemning him in a *Roman* Council; which had its desired Effect, say they: And by this Act of Pope *Alexander* III. that Sentence seems to be confirmed by God in Favour of the Privilege of St. *Peter*. Thus Rebels, when they flie in the Face of their Sovereign, cloak their Villanies with Religion, and make God the Patron of their damnable Machinations and Practices.

In this Council, Pope *Alexander* delegates *Galdin* Archbishop of *Milan* with Authority to depose the Schismatick Bishops, as he calls them, and to restore the Catholicks to their Sees. Whereupon *Galdin* sends Two Nuncio's to the Prelate of the Church of *Lauden*, and other Prelates, Abbots, and Clerks, advising them to relinquish the Interest of Pope *Paschal* and the Emperor *Frederick*, and side with Pope *Alexander*; which if they refused to do, they were to be deprived *a Beneficio & Officio*. This struck them with a mighty Consternation; for most of them had sworn to maintain Pope *Paschal*'s Right; and besides, they had sworn canonical Obedience to *Albert de Merlin* Bishop of *Lauden*, at that Time, as they thought, a Catholick Bishop, and undepos'd; which Oath they could not in Honour cancel. Under this terrible Apprehension they meet and debate what was most expedient to be done. On the one Hand they conclude, that if Pope *Paschal* and the Emperor should succeed, their relinquishing their Obedience and Allegiance would draw a severe Resentment on them from both, and deprive them for ever of their Dignities. On the other Hand, if they should refuse to comply with the Commands of Archbishop *Galdin* and Pope *Alexander*, who in a great Measure were Conquerors in those Parts, and considering at the same Time the general Revolt of the Cities of *Lombardy*, they could expect nothing less than an utter

utter Extirpation and Expulsion. This was a shocking Dilemma; but they did not long labour under it, for Necessity and Fear prevailed against Reason. A Man that argues upon Principle soon resolves in the Right; and though Necessity, with all the affrighting Consequences, stares him in the Face, it cannot warp his honest Judgment, but he resolutely determines to abide by his Duty, his only true Interest. Necessity is no Argument for any Man to comply with an unjust Act; in which both the Complier and Compeller have much to answer for. The former may move Compassion, but the latter will attract Hatred.

Pope *Alexander* III. pushes on his good Fortune, and with the Help of the *Venetians* forces the Emperor to very dishonourable Conditions of Peace; upon which he is absolved from his former Ecclesiastick Censure. The Conditions indeed were dishonourable in the End; for he was forced to prostrate himself at the Pope's Feet, who, (good Man!) to shew his Humility, proudly set his Foot upon the Emperor's Neck, using the Expression of the Royal Prophet: *Thou shalt walk upon the Basilisk and Asp; thou shalt tread the Lion and Dragon under thy Feet.* This was Humility with a Vengeance indeed, if to trample upon distressed Majesty could be call'd so! The Editors, in their History of the Third *Lateran* General Council, give this Part of the Story a very gentle Touch, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1504. for they only say, that the Emperor being defeated, and the *German* Princes reproaching him with the Schism he had occasion'd, he began to repent; and throwing himself at the Pope's Feet, he obtained a firm and lasting Peace. Very modest truly! But not one Word of the proud Insult of treading on the Emperor's Neck. But as silent as

they are pleaſed to be, in this, *Pariſ. Sabell.* and others, are not ſparing.

The Ambition of this Pope knew no Bounds: Though he had enough to do with the Emperor of *Germany*, yet at the ſame Time he engages in Controverſy with *Henry* II. King of *England*, where he had an Inſtrument in the Perſon of Archbiſhop *Becket*, fit for his Purpoſe. The Story is well known, and therefore I ſhall not dwell long on it. The haughty Inſults of the Pope, and the Pride of *Becket* ſupported by him, grew ſo intollerable, that nothing leſs than the Delivering up all the Cuſtoms and Uſuages in the *Engliſh* Church would ſatisfy their Ambition. The Style of the Pope's Letters to the King and Archbiſhop *Becket* on this Occaſion was very inſolent; and *Becket*'s was no way inferior to it. In his Tenth Epiſtle the Pope tells the King, *he uſurps the Power of Chriſt. Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1196. In the ſame Epiſtle he ſets the Example of *Saul* before him, who, for having reſerved Part of the Plunder of the conquer'd *Amalekites*, contrary to the Command of God, was caſt off by him, and another choſen in his Place in his Lifetime: And not only threatens the King, but his Poſterity likewiſe, with the Example of *Rehobeam*, who for the Sins of his Father, King *Solomon*, was depriv'd of his Kingdom. The King of *England*, conſidering the Uſage that ſeveral Princes had met with from the Biſhops of *Rome*, and not inferior to what they threaten'd him with in the Two foreſaid Examples, had Reaſon to believe Pope *Alexander* would be as good as his Word: He therefore endeavours a Reconciliation; but *Becket*, without a plenary Conceſſion of all the Pope's Demands, will liſten to nothing. Continuing thus inflexible in his Reſolution, and perſiſting to attack the King's Authority, and the known Laws of the Land, with

an

an insupportable Obstinacy, he is by common Consent banished the Kingdom. At Six Years End he is restor'd to his See; but continuing his former Insolencies, he is assasinated; and in the Year 1173, he is canoniz'd by Pope *Alexander* III. Archbishop *Becket* being thus sainted, the Pope acquaints the Monks of *Canterbury* with it by Letter, *ibid. p.* 1226. wherein, after much Praise of his Merit, he exhorts them *to implore his Interest with God for the Salvation of the Faithful, and Peace of the universal Church.* This is a violent Encroachment on the Office of our Blessed Advocate Jesus Christ, whom St. *John* in his First Epistle, *c.* 2. *v.* 1, 2. calls Advocate and Propitiation for our Sins, and of the whole World. With what Authority the Bishop of *Rome* could invest a departed Soul, though canoniz'd here below, with such a Power in Heaven, I cannot see; but he that will assume such a Power, will not fail to defend it. As for Archbishop *Becket*, he had highly provok'd the King by his Contempt and other Actions, unbecoming the Character he bore; which drew the Odium of the whole Nation upon him; but none of this could deserve the severe Treatment he met with at last. The Manner of his Death was barbarous and sacrilegious; and, if the King were conscious of it, his whole Life could not have been a sufficient Attonement for it; but however it was, *A. D.* 1171, the King did publick Pennance.

This Pope having thus carried his Point in *England*, though at the Expence of *Becket*'s Blood, resolves not only to maintain his Ground in this Part of the Island, but likewise further Northward, where he had some Time before gain'd Footing. Accordingly he lords it over the King and Bishops of *Scotland*, where he claims the Right of Investitures, as if his Predecessors had fix'd them

in the Apostolick See some Centuries before; turning out *Hugh*, whom the King had made Archbishop of St. *Andrew*'s, excommunicating him for intruding into that See, and commanding all the Bishops of *Scotland* to shun him as an excommunicated Person, until the said *Hugh* had made Satisfaction to the Bishop and Church of St. *Andrew*, and others, whom he had injur'd. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1240. And in the same Page there is an Epistle of this Pope's to *William* King of *Scotland*, written in the most arrogant Style of any Thing hitherto. The Case was this: The King of *Scotland* had, by Vertue of his Regal Power, displac'd *John* Bishop of St. *Andrew*'s, and subrogated *Hugh* in his Room: But *Alexius*, the Pope's Legate, had deposed *Hugh*, and by his Order confirmed *John* in the See of St. *Andrew*'s. Upon which Occasion the Pope writes to King *William*, and commands him to suffer *John* Bishop of St. *Andrew*'s to enjoy his Bishoprick quietly, or else he would excommunicate both him and his Kingdom, peremptorily restraining the King to the Space of Twenty Days after the Receipt of his Letters, to establish firm Peace and Security to Bishop *John*; adding moreover, that if he persisted in his violent Resolution of disturbing him, whereas he had studied to set his Kingdom at Liberty, he would now make it his Business to reduce them to their former Subjection. *Ibid. p.* 1241.

The Sixty first Epistle, to *Richard* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and his Suffragans, about the Peace between him and the Emperor *Frederick*, is a Piece of meer Vanity and Ostentation, and not as he would have it be thought, a Piece of Devotion; for he proudly values himself upon the Emperor's Submission, who he says did as his Ancestors had done. It's true indeed, some Emperors have been forc'd

to

ery abject Condition by the Popes, and have great Concessions and Submissions to the Bi- of *Rome*; but Pope *Alexander* III. was the first ver treated a Sovereign Prince in so vile and a Manner as to set his Foot upon his His Holiness is indeed so modest as to take otice of this servile Treatment of the Empe- either of his Epistles to the two *English* Arch- s; but in that to *Roger* Archbishop of *York*, *ugh* Bishop of *Durham*, he expresses something near it; for, after he has told them of the er of the Emperor's Submission, of his giving e Kiss of Peace, and how the Emperor per- the Office of a Gentleman-Usher in con- g his Holiness into the Church; "After we orm'd the Solemnity of Mass, says he, he ducted us to the Church Gate; where, as we unted our Palfry, he held the Stirrop, and l the usual Honour and Respect to us which Predecessors had paid to ours." *Lab. T.* 10. 5. This cannot be so easily proved as said; this very Emperor, *viz. Frederick Barbarossa*, never heard that any Pope had exacted such ence from any crown'd Head as that of hold- ie Stirrop, or prostrating their Necks at the Feet; this very Emperor being the first ficiated as Groom of the Stirrop to the Bi- f *Rome*, and that was to Pope *Adrian* IV. so is Holiness was very mnch besides his Infal- to say that these Submissions were according tom, which never had been known before nperor's.

71st Epistle of this Pope to *Lewis* VII. King *ice*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1336. *Append.* II. plainly de- ates, that though the Bishop of *Rome* had hout *Germany*, *Italy*, *Sicily*, and other Parts, ong Struggling, wrested the Right of In- vestitures

veſtitures out of the Hands of the Secular Princes; yet he had not gained ſo far upon *France*; for Archbiſhop *Becket* being grown ſo troubleſome to King *Henry*, that there was a Neceſſity for removing him; the Pope, who had all along fomented this Pique, and promoted this Miſunderſtanding for his own Intereſt, writes to the King of *France*, deſiring him, that if there were any Biſhoprick or Abbey void in his Kingdom, that he would beſtow it on Archbiſhop *Becket*, for the Support of him and his Followers, who would rather ſacrifice all they had than conſent to the Detriment of the Pope or the Church. Had the Biſhop of *Rome* at that Time had the ſame Power in *France* that he had in the Countries above-mentioned, and for which he was at that Time contending in *England*, he had not been oblig'd to court the King of *France* to what he otherwiſe would have commanded: They never write in a ſupplicant Style where they know they have Power; 'twas always below a Biſhop of *Rome* to ſue, their Style is lofty and threat'ning, and thundering out Anathema's upon the leſt Refuſal or Denial.

A. D. 1160, or as ſome will, 1170, the *Vaudoies*, *Albigenſes*, *&c.* began to appear; who ſoon ſpread over moſt Parts of *Europe*; particularly in *Germany*, *France*, and *England*. It is certain that they began before the Year 1170, becauſe in the Year 1160 they came over into *England*, where in a Council held at *Oxford* they were condemned. The firſt conſiderable Appearance of them was at *Lyons* in *France*; where, in a great Crowd of People, one of them dying ſuddenly, the reſt were mightily frighted; but eſpecially *Peter Waldius*, who immediately ſold what he had, and gave to the Poor. Upon this great Multitudes flock'd to him, to whom he expounded the New Teſtament in the vulgar Tongue,

Tongue, and taught Orthodox Doctrine relating to Faith and Morals. As to the Soundness of Principles and Doctrine of these People, nothing shews more of them than their strict and regular Life; of which, notwithstanding their Malice, *Æneas Sylvius*, afterwards Pope *Pius* II. in his *Hist. Bohem. cap.* 35. *p* 103. and before him *Reinerius Sachonus*, who lived in the Middle of the 13th Century, in his *Summa de Catharis*, *c.* 45. *&c.* speak very favourably. The latter of which, after he has distinctly enumerated the Errors of this Sect, which he calls *Blasphemies*, he gives them the fairest Character any Friend ever could bestow on them; and therefore, whether they deserv'd the Name of *Blasphemers*, let the Impartial judge. "This Sect, says "he, are a People of great Piety, living very justly "and honestly before all Men, and believing or-"thodoxly of God, and all the Articles contain'd "in the Creed, only they blaspheme the Church "of *Rome* and her Clergy." Here was the Sting that gall'd them, and the Source of those poor People's Miseries. They slighted the modern Opinions, condemn'd the corrupt Practices, and severely reprehended the Superstition and Tyranny of the Church of *Rome*. These Things created them many Enemies every where, insomuch that at last, in the 3d General *Lateran* Council, *A. D.* 1179. under *Alexander* III. they were condemned, where Can. XXVII. they were not only excommunicated themselves, but all People were forbid, under Pain of Excommunication, to entertain them in their Houses, or any where else, or to have any Dealing or Conversation with them. Being thus severely dealt with, they dispers'd themselves into several Countries, providing for themselves as well as they could.

Since

Since we have once more touch'd upon this same *Lateran* Council, it will not be improper to take Notice how careful Pope *Alexander* III. was to secure the Right of Election of the Bishop of *Rome* in the *College* of Cardinals for the future, wholly excluding every Sort of People else; the Method of Election being set down in the first Canon, *viz.* "That he should be acknowledg'd for Pope, "who was chosen by *Two Thirds* of the Cardinals, "and that if any one should insist upon his being "chosen by One Third, and should usurp the "Name of Bishop, both he and they that receiv'd "him should be excommunicated, *&c.*" The Second Canon makes void all Elections of the Antipope *Victor* IV. and other Schismatick Bishops, and reverses all Alienations by Invaders, *&c.* There is no Abjuration in this Canon, but in the History of this Council, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1505. the Editors have inserted the very Form of it, which all the *German* Bishops, and those of other Provinces, were oblig'd to take, upon their being receiv'd into the Unity of the Catholick Church by Pope *Alexander* III. In this Form, after they have renounc'd all Heresy against the Holy Catholick *Roman* Church, particularly the Schism of *Octavian*, *Guido*, *&c.* they swear Obedience to the Church, the Pope, and his lawful Successors. The Oath to the Church is in a Canonical Sense, but to the Pope they swear in both Senses, *i. e.* Ecclesiastical and Civil; *Me obediturum juro, & promitto Fidelitatem Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, & Domino meo Alexandro.* Which last Words include a Temporal Sovereignty; for if it had been meant only in an Ecclesiastical Sense, it would have been *Domino Alexandro*, not *Domino meo Alexandro.*

To this Council the Editors have very unnecessarily tack'd an Appendix from *Bartholomew Laurens*, con-

consisting of 48 Parts, each Part containing many Chapters; of which the first only relates to this Council, the rest being foreign to it, as the same *Bartholom.* in his Preface to it owns, many of them belonging to other Popes long after *Alexander's* Time. In short, they are nothing but a Collection of Papal Decrees, publish'd as well before as after this Council, and therefore improperly plac'd here.

[1181.] *Lucius* III. before called *Humbald*, is chosen Pope in the Room of *Alexander* III. according to the Form prescrib'd by the *Lateran* Council, *i. e.* by Two Thirds of the Cardinals. Of whom there is little said by the Editors: But the Council of *Verona*, which was held *A. D.* 1184, shews as great an Instance of Prevarication in this Infallible Judge as Man could be guilty of. The Emperor *Frederick* coming into *Italy*, Pope *Lucius* goes out of *Rome* to meet him; (not so much out out of Respect, I suppose, as to prevent his coming to *Rome*; where he was not over desirous of seeing any more Emperors) the Pretence was to confer with the Emperor about the Affairs of the Christians in *Asia*, which began to decline very much: However they meant on either Side, it's certain they met at *Verona*: To which Place great Multitudes of People flock'd from several Parts, especially Ecclesiasticks, who desired the Reconciliation of the Apostolick See, and, as having follow'd the Emperor in a Schism, were ordained by Antipopes. The Emperor intercedes for them, as he had just Cause so to do, and desires to have them receiv'd. To which the Pope very kindly consents. But the next Day, when the People expected the Reconciliation by Imposition of Hands, the Pope's Mind ter'd, urging, that according to the Council of *Venice* he could not do it; promising at the same Time to call ano-

another Council in which that Matter ſhould be compromis'd. This was a very poor Evaſion for the Biſhop of the Firſt See to make, for the Council of *Venice* had no Relation to this Matter. In that Pope *Alexander* III. and the Emperor were reconcil'd, and the Antipope *Paſchal*, with thoſe he ordain'd, depoſed. What was this to *Lucius* III.? Here was the Emperor interceding for the Clergy that had ſided with him, and requeſting a Reconciliation for them; who were, no Doubt, convinc'd they were in the Wrong, by their earneſt Deſire of being reconcil'd. We'll allow their Crime was Schiſm. Should not then a true Father of the Church readily and chearfully have extended his Arms to embrace them upon their Return? Beſides, his urging the Council of *Venice* in his own Defence makes againſt him: For there the Emperor and Pope *Alexander* III. were reconcil'd; and therefore after Seven Years Space, (*viz.* from the Council of *Venice* to this of *Verona*) it was high Time that there was a Reconciliation, eſpecially when the Chief of this Breach had been receiv'd into Communion. The Editors, indeed, lay the Blame of the Pope's altering his Mind on *Conrad* Biſhop of *Mentz*, and the Biſhop of *Worms*, but give no Reaſon for it, and conſequently no Excuſe for the Pope, who had actually conſented to a Reconciliation at the Interceſſion of the Emperor; but the next Day flew from it. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1734, 1741.

The Firſt Epiſtle of this Pope, *ibid. p.* 1735. to the Biſhops and Clergy of *Scotland*, is as dangerous a Lecture for the Propagation of Rebellion as can be penn'd. The King of *Scotland* having been excommunicated by *Roger* Archbiſhop of *York*, by Order from Pope *Alexander* III. and his whole Kingdom put under Interdict; Pope *Lucius* III. abſolves them all; of which he gives Notice to the

Bi-

Bishops and Clergy of *Scotland* in this Epistle; "Wherefore, says he, the Excommunication and "Interdict being taken off, we command you by "these Apostolick Writings, freely and without "Scruple to communicate with him as a Catho-"lick Prince, and one that is in Communion with "the Apostolick See, and that you pay him all due "Honour. For the more sincere we find him in his "Devotion to the Church and Ecclesiastick Persons, "the greater Honour we desire may be paid him in "all Things." By this it is plain, his Infallible Holiness outdoes the old Republican Principle of making the Duty from Subject to King, and King to Subject, reciprocal and conditional, and that if the King fails on his Part, the Subject is free from his: For here, if the King disoblige the Pope, or any Ecclesiastick, the Pope thunders out an Anathema against him immediately; that is, proclaiming throughout any Kingdom, That the King being excommunicated, the Subjects were absolv'd from their Allegiance. This the latter Part of the Epistle asserts, and thence it's plain, that they make the Allegiance of Subjects but conditional; for the King of *Scotland* was to be honour'd by them, proportionably to his Respect to the Church and Church-men. This was no more than what had actually been committed by Popes of *Rome* and their Legates in the Southern Part of this Island but just before. The Clergy of *England* being grown so exorbitant, that they were frequently guilty of Murder, and other Enormities, King *Henry* II. no longer able to bear with them, lets the Laws loose against them. Whereupon Archbishop *Becket* stands up resolutely for the Immunity of the Clergy from the Civil Power; affirming, they owed not any Obedience but to the *Roman* Pontiff only. But of this Kind, we have al-

already named several Instances, and shall meet with many more e'er long.

[1185.] *Urban* II. before called *Lambert*, and *Gregory* VIII. before called *Albert*, *A. D.* 1187. have nothing remarkable said of them by the Editors; but that they were very pressing with the Christian Princes to recover the Holy Land. Though neither of them came up to Pope *Clement* III. before called *Paulinus*, *A. D.* 1188, who, to persuade People more readily to take upon them the Holy Cross, promises them, by the Authority of God and the Holy Apostles. St. *Peter* and *Paul*, Absolution from all the Sins they had penitently confess'd. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1752.

In this Pope's Time the forementioned Case between *William* King of *Scotland* and him is revir'd, concerning the Bishoprick of St. *Andrew's*; to which Pope *Alexander* III. had preferr'd *John*, and the King *Hugh*; who insisting on the King's Right of Presentation, obstinately keeps Possession: Upon which this Pope writes to King *William*, taxing *Hugh* with Contumacy in refusing to obey his Citation; and, in a different Style to what Pope *Alexander* III. wrote, uses many soft Words and Entreaties, putting him in Mind of the Reverence and Duty he owes to the Apostolick See: But, it seems, he could not yet prevail, by the Epistle he writes on the same Argument to *Henry* II. King of *England*; entreating him to use his Interest with the King of *Scotland* in this Case, to persuade him to a Compliance; and, if he could not prevail by fair Means, to compel him by Force. *Ibid. p.* 1755. By such Ways as these have the Bishops of *Rome* maintain'd their Usurpations over distant Churches; tho', considering how ill King *Henry* had been treated by his Predecessor *Alexander* III. this Pope had little Reason to expect the King of *England* should

espouse his Interest; but the Bishops of *Rome* never valued how unjustly they engaged Princes in War, if they promoted but their Ends. By what Means this Business was determin'd does not appear plainly from the Editors; but by this Pope's Fourth Epistle to *William* King of *Scotland*, it looks as if he had carried his Point for *John*, whom he had made Bishop of St. *Andrew's*. The Church of *Scotland* had hitherto been subject to the Primacy of *York*; but Pope *Clement* III. exempts the Bishops of *Scotland* from all Obedience to the See of *York*; adding, that for the future none but such as were Subjects of the Crown of *Scotland*, (except whom his Holiness should appoint) should exercise the Office of Legate there. Whether by these Means or not this Matter was compos'd, I will not say; though it looks very probable: But if it were so, all that can be made of it is this; the See of *York* lost a great Branch of her Primacy, and *Scotland* gain'd nothing by it: And the whole shews the Encroachment of the Pope more than his Justice.

Unless the Editors had a Mind to make this Pope as infamous as any of his Predecessors, they would not have mention'd the following Story of him. *William* King of *Sicily* dying without Children, his Kinsman *Tancred* claims the Kingdom, and raises a civil War: To extinguish which, King *Henry* (afterwards Emperor, his Father being gone to the Holy-Land) in Right of his Wife *Constantia*, the next Heir to the Kingdom, [*Hæredem Regni proximiorem*, *ib. p.* 1753.] sends an Army into *Italy*; which, after much Mischief done to the Rebels, [*cum plurima damna Rebellibus intulisset*, *ib.*] return'd to *Italy re infectâ*. And the Reason of this is very plain from the following Words: *Pontifex Tancredo favens ei Investituram Regni dedit*: "The Pope favouring *Tancred*, bestowed the Investiture of the Kingdom

 "on

" on him." Here was the most open Injustice that could be practis'd; for they own that the Emperor's Wife *Constantia* was the next Heir to the Crown, calling those that opposed her Forces, Rebels; and yet have the harden'd Front to say, that the Pope, favouring the Invader *Tancred*, invested him with the Kingdom. What they mean by stigmatizing their Pontiffs of *Rome* with these Marks of Infamy, I cannot imagine; except by them they would have the World believe, that their lawless unbounded Supremacy can commend every Thing. They must be wretchedly infatuated with wild Notions of Ambition, who found the Right of Supremacy upon the Power or Opportunity of doing a great wicked Action.

[1191.] Pope *Celestine* III. before call'd *Jacinth*, succeeds; whose Character is much better with the Editors than his Predecessors: (Not that they blame them for the vile Actions before-mentioned.) But *Baronius*, like the Editors sometimes, will be doing, though it be Mischief, otherwise he might have left out that Passage in his Annals, *ad An.* 1191. where he says: The same Year that Pope *Celestine* was consecrated, King *Henry* VI. came to *Rome*, where he was invested with the Imperial Crown by the Pope, who (like others of his Predecessors, to shew his Humility) kick'd the Crown off his Head, signifying hereby that he had Power to depose him, if he deserv'd Ill from him. This was a very odd Emblem, and the Manner of it as unseemly: But it must be a very barren Fact indeed, that the Editors or their Friends, with their fertile Ingenuity, cannot raise some Advantage from. Had the Emperor resented such a brutal Action, as with Justice he might, he had been a Heretick, Schismatick, and what not; but if his Holiness commits the greatest Outrage, foments the most unna-

unnatural Rebellion, *&c.* if he miscarries he is a Saint; and though he dies in the Fact, is a Martyr.

[1198.] Cardinal *Lotharius*, in Imitation of his Predecessors, under the Name of *Innocent* III. mounts the Pontifical Throne, and closes this Century with as remarkable an Action as his Predecessors had begun it. His First was a Magisterial Attempt upon the Imperial Dignity, to shew his Supremacy over that and other Crowns, which he would have the World believe held of the Court of *Rome*. He was indeed in the Strength and Vigour of his Age, being but Seven and thirty Years old when he was promoted to the Papal Dignity. His whole Pontificate was a continued Series of Pride, attended with most sordid Avarice; which *Matthew Paris, ad Ann.* 1213. *p.* 245. very wittily expresses; where, speaking of King *John* of *England*, he says, *He knew by Experience, that the Pope was proud and ambitious above all Mankind, and insatiably thirsty after Money, for the Sake of which he was very flexible and inclinable to all Manner of Wickedness.* This is a black Character indeed, considering from whom it came; but as black as it is, his Holiness verified it to a Tittle. The First Instance of exerting the Papal Supremacy was in the Case of *Otho* and *Philip*, the Two Competitors for the Empire; for the former of which he declared, who receiv'd the Imperial Crown from his Hands, with the usual Benediction and Solemnity, at *Aix la Chapelle* in *Germany*. This was a shameful Act of Injustice in the infallible Judge; for *Philip* had not only a fairer Claim by Right of Inheritance, (being Brother to the Emperor *Henry* VI. whereas *Otho* was very distantly related, (if at all) being Son to *Henricus Leo* Duke of *Saxony*) but he was likewise duly elected according to the Constitution by the Princes

of the Empire However, his Holineſs breaks through Right, Conſtitution, Obligation, or any Thing that lies in his Way; and to incapacitate poor *Philip* the more, he excommunicates him, and all that ſhould adhere to him, or his Intereſt; which ſoon had its deſired Effect; for though *Philip* was crown'd at *Mentz*, he was forc'd to quit his Claim, being deſerted by all upon the Pope's thundering out his *Anathema* againſt him. But this Sunſhine of the Pope's upon his Favourite *Otho* is ſoon obſcured; as ſhall be obſerved in its proper Place.

In the Year 1199, the People of *Metz* having for ſome Time, in Imitation of *Peter Waldi* and the *Vaudois*, practiſed the Reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar Tongue, were by Pope *Innocent* III. forbid the Uſe of them after that Manner. Thus was Popery advanced by the Suppreſſion of Religion; and the Word of God in a great meaſure extinguiſh'd, leſt by the Light of it, the vile Artifices of the Court and Biſhop of *Rome*, with their unjuſtifiable Practices, ſhould be detected. This ſame Year, beſides *Philip*, *Marchobald* King of *Sicily*, and *Philip* King of *France*, were excommunicated by Pope *Innocent*; the latter of which not ſubmitting to a Divorce from his Wife, the Pope adds to his Sentence, by laying his whole Country under an Interdict of religious Worſhip; which Sentence was confirm'd by the Councils of *Dijon* and *Vienna* in *France*, but taken off the next Year in the Synod of *Nivelle*; and the Caſe of this King's Matrimony being argued the ſame Year in the Synod of *Soiſſons*, the Matter was drop'd.

[1200.] We are now arrived at the Thirteenth Century, famous for the many and remarkable Things tranſacted in it. In this Age, SCHOOL-DIVINITY, which before had but barely been introduc'd, gain'd firm Footing. In the more ear-

ly Ages of the Church, the Apostles, and those Holy Apostolick Men their Successors, delivered that pure and genuine Doctrine which they had received from our Blessed Lord, in a Method plain and easy, and accommodated to the meanest Capacity; avoiding those Perplexities which attend litigious Disputes, except when Necessity required a more minute Way of arguing in Defence of the Faith against the Gentiles and Hereticks. In the Instructing of their Catechumens, or Novices in Christianity, they used a short Form of Profession of their Faith, containing the Heads of Evangelical Learning; which they more at large explained in their Sermons. Of this Sort were those admirable Catechetical Lectures of St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* and St. *Gregory Nicen.* together with the proper Homilies, which contain'd an Exposition of some Part of the Old and New Testament, or some practical moral Doctrine. But when this Primitive-Ecclesiastical Purity and Simplicity grew into Disuse, they set up a more sublime and subtile Way of Reasoning; which was chiefly taken from *Dionysius* the Sham-Areopagite in the latter Part of the Fourth Century. But it is most certain, that about the Middle of the Eighth Century, *John Damascene* the *Syrian* was the First that gain'd *School-Divinity* that Preheminence, which it for many Ages maintain'd in the *Greek*, and afterwards in the *Latin* Church. It was he that brought Theology to that nice and accurate Method, distributing his Notions under proper Heads, as appears in his Four Books, *De Fide Orthodoxa.* In the First of which he treats of the Unity and Trinity of the Godhead, with its Nature and Properties. In the Second, of the Creation, and the several Kinds of Creatures. In the Third, of the Incarnation of the Word, and the personal Union of both Natures; of the

Life, Death, and Descent of Christ into Hell. In the Fourth, of the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ; of Faith, and the Sacraments; of Reliques and Images; of the Law of God, Sabbath, Circumcision, and Antichrist, and of the Resurrection of the Flesh. Several of which are tender Points: And though he, and other School-Divines since, have spun their Notions of them very fine, they are rather amusing than instructing: And to acquire Applause to themselves, they have too often render'd that difficult and obscure which in it self is plain and easy. Besides, the Enquiring into and Defining the Nature of Mysteries, borders so very near upon prophaning them, that it is very much to be feared, the Loosenes of the later Ages is in a great Measure owing to their busy Curiosity; or, I fear I have too much Cause to say, their Vanity in shewing their own Abilities. But how fond soever the *Greek* Church was of these Notions, it's certain, that in the *Latin* Church they were not entertain'd for near 400 Years after; *Lanfranc* Archbishop of *Canterbury* being said by some to have been a great Encourager of School-Divinity, though this scarce appears by his Works. *Peter Abailard*, in the Beginning of the Twelfth Century, and *Peter Lombard*, about the Middle, carry it on in the same Steps *Damascene* had begun; so that by this Time Theology had put on quite another Aspect, her Arguments restrained to a Philosophical Method, and the Thread of Reasoning drawn so fine, that it was as unintelligible as it was invisible. *Peter Lombard* is followed by a vast Train, *viz. Alexander Hales*, *Thomas Aquinas*, *Albertus Magnus*, *&c.* who, having quitted the more plain and pure Doctrine of the Ancients, betake themselves wholly to *School-Divinity*, and the *Aristotelian* Philosophy; and that not from the *Greek*

Origi-

Originals, but from the imperfect Traditions of the *Arabians*; being generally taken from Versions ill done, and worse understood. However, by this they made their Way; and Primitive Divinity was so far laid aside, that instead of the Authority of St. *Paul*, *Aristotle* keeps the Chair, and is become the sole Moderator in all Theological Disputes. A melancholy Face of Things! But for what End this *School-Divinity* was started, and how it has answer'd the Establishment of the Papal Majesty, the Reader may observe from *Damascene* the Founder, (who was the great Champion of Image-Worship, *A. D.* 730.) and the rest of the Schoolmen; all or most of which were eminent in their Times for maintaining and defending the Encroachments and Usurpations of the Court and Bishop of *Rome* in Temporals as well as Ecclesiasticks. There are several Things relating to this Century, of which something might in a general Proem be said; but I shall take them according to their Series of Time.

This Century begins with the Council of *Paris*, *A. D.* 1201. in which, one *Evrard* a Knight, whom *Henry* Count of *Nevers* had made President of his Estate, was accused of the *Bulgarian* Heresy. He was a Man of great Ability in State-Affairs, but an Oppressor of those under him, say the Editors, *T.* 11. *p.* 24. *par.* 1. (so easy is it to take an Occasion of quarrelling with those we hate!) However, he is summoned to appear before the Pope's Legate in Council, where he is condemned of Heresy, and sentenc'd to the Flames, to expiate his Crime; being first delivered to his Master, Count *Henry*, to make up his Accounts, and afterwards to the Executioner at *Nevers*, where he accordingly suffered. Here was the Beginning of Propagation by *Fire and Fagot*.

The ſame Year the Editors pretend a Council in *Scotland*, about the better celebrating the Lord's-Day, but name no Biſhop or Legate preſiding in it, or any Perſon to give the Colour of a Synod to it, only *Euſtachius*, Abbot *de Flay*. But this was with no other Deſign than to propagate a ridiculous Legend of Lies, call'd the *Celeſtial Epiſtle*. This Abbot *de Flay* was a Man of a moſt holy Life, who perceiving the Looſeneſs of the Age in the Celebration of the Lord's-Day, made it his Buſineſs to travel through ſeveral Countries, to perſuade the People to a more ſtrict Obſervation of it; which was attended with many Miracles. That this *Celeſtial Epiſtle* is a Fiction, take *Coſſart*'s Word, *ibid. p.* 27. where, in his Note at the End of it, he ſays: "For what Reaſon *Binius* ſhould "intrude this Fiction of the *Celeſtial Epiſtle* into his "Collection of the Councils, and call it a Coun-"cil, I cannot ſee." It's certain, *Binius* never ſticks at any Thing, whether true or falſe, or ever ſo groſs, that will but anſwer ſome End; but then I think *Coſſart* might have ſav'd himſelf the Trouble of inſerting this ridiculous Fiction, if he had thought it ſuch, (as it's plain he does;) for by ſo doing he makes himſelf as fabulous an Editor as *Binius*. But this is no new Thing with them, (as has been before obſerv'd) for the very Forgeries and Fictions which they condemn as ſuch, have often been introduc'd at ſome Diſtance for genuine Authority: therefore whoever reads them muſt be upon his Guard.

A. D. 1206. a Council was call'd at *Reading* in *Berkſhire* by *Ferentine* the Pope's Legate. This the Editors take from *Matthew Paris*'s Annals, who is altogether ſilent of the Cauſe of its being call'd, or what was done in it: But to the ſame Year, p. 214. he adds, "That *Ferentine* having taken a

"*Tour*

" *Tour* through *England*, had gathered a vast Sum " of Money together, which he carefully dispos'd; " and hastening to the Sea-side, bid *England* adieu." But *Matthew Westminster* is plainer in this Matter; for, *p.* 63. after having almost repeated *Matthew Paris*'s Words, adds: " After the Legate had heap'd " up a great Sum of Money, he held a Council, " lest he should be thought to do nothing." This was doing something indeed: But as to the Council, it is plain it was but a Blind to cover the Legate's Errand; which was to raise Money, and not to hold Councils. It was, no Doubt a clandestine Act, otherwise the Legate, according to *M. Paris*, would not have been so sollicitous in securing the Money, and making so much Hast out of *England*. The Editors having cited *M. Paris* for this Council, as aforesaid, tell us, That *M. Westminster* says the same; but wisely leave out the Words, *That he held a Council, lest he should be thought to do nothing.* Notwithstanding this mighty Mass of Treasure which *Ferentine* the Legate carried from *England*, Pope *Innocent* cannot forbear exerting his Authority further. About this Time he plays the Fury, resolving to let crown'd Heads feel the Weight of his Universal Censure. Accordingly he thunders out his *Anathema's* against them, deprives *Philip* King of *France*, and absolves his Subjects from their Allegiance, forbidding them, under Pain of most direful Curses, to pay any Obedience to him. He uses *John* King of *England* after the same Manner, for refusing to admit *Stephen Langton*, whom he had nominated to the See of *Canterbury*; laying the whole Kingdom under an Interdict. These are dreadful Instances of Tyranny in the Bishop of *Rome*; but considering their vile and abject Treatment of several Emperors and Kings before, this is no more than what could be expected from them.

them. There was now no Power left in the Church to dispute Superiority with them; for all Things there submit to the arbitrary Sway of the *Roman* Pontiff: To secure which, he casts a jealous Eye on the Civil Power of Secular Princes; and, under Pretence of Ecclesiastick Censure, terrifies them into a Compliance with his illegal exorbitant Demands and Encroachments; which, if they refuse, he not only excommunicates them, but lays their Countries under his Interdict; and to make them still more sensible of his Universal Sovereignty, he exhorts their Subjects to fly in their Faces, by absolving them from their Duty, and forbidding them under severe Penalties to pay them Obedience. What Extravagancies will not Men commit when they give themselves up to ungovernable Ambition and sordid Avarice? What Seas of Blood, and immense Treasures, have been expended in the Support of this wild Notion of Supremacy? How many crown'd Heads have bled under their execrable Resentment; and what vile and unjustifiable Actions have been committed by their Partisans to maintain this ill-gotten Sovereignty? That Meekness which our Blessed Lord and his Disciples taught and practised, and commanded all, especially the Pastors of his Flock, to imitate, is by them turn'd into extream Cruelty; their very Priests, whose Office is to feed the Souls of God's People, turn'd into Ruffians and Assassines; and it has, more than once, been thought meritorious to take off a King that stood in their Way. Of what dangerous Consequence these Examples have been, the Christian World to this Time is sensible; especially they who have too fatally felt the Prosecution of those Principles, and that wretched Spawn of Sectaries which crawl'd from them, have given too many Instances of their Similitude to the

the Dam from whence they came, in perpetrating the same Facts under Pretence of serving God and his Church. But to return.

The Emperor *Otho* having by Pope *Innocent's* Means obtained the Imperial Diadem, had not long been in Possession of it, but he turns upon his Benefactor, refusing to stand to the Oath and Terms upon which the Pope had invested him with the Empire. It was great Imprudence in *Otho* to contend with the supreme Infallible Judge, who soon made him sensible of his Temerity and Folly in offering to break with a Power that could as easily unmake as it had made him. His first Quarrel was with the *Romans*, who quickly drove him out of their City; upon which, contrary to the Pope's Mind, he seizes several Cities and Towns in *Apulia*, and adds *Sicily* to the rest of his Conquests. The Pope admonishes him by Letters and Messengers, but to no Purpose. Had the Emperor fallen upon any other Country than *Sicily*, or what was a Feudal of the Church, the Pope had never quarrel'd with him. But as Pope *Innocent* III. in *Ep.* 188, and 189, to the Emperor, says, "If you forbear "the Patrimony of the Church, I shall shew no "Favour, or give Assistance, to *Frederick* or any "other, according to the Stipulation betwixt us; "but *Sicily* being Part of the Church's Patrimony, "I cannot but dissuade and dehort you from in-"vading it; which if you persist in, I shall main-"tain and defend by all possible Means; but you "must expect Excommunication." It's a Sign the Emperor *Otho* did not well know a Bishop of *Rome*. He might have believed every Word he threatned him with; nay, might consequently have expected worse than he threatned. The Bishops of *Rome* do not often make good their Promises in Favour of any but themselves, but when they threaten any one,

one, they generally exceed their Word. This *Otho* found by fatal Experience, for he is no sooner declared excommunicate, but he is depos'd, being on all Sides beset with so many and powerful Enemies, and deserted by his Friends, (For who dare oppose the Infallible Supreme ?) he retires to *Brunsick*, where he dies of Grief.

The Fourth General *Lateran* Council is by the Editors, in *Con. Tom.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 117. introduc'd with a History after the usual Manner; wherein, they say, the First Thing resolved upon was a general Confession of the Catholick Faith. Several pernicious Doctrines and Encroachments of the Church of *Rome* had been attempted in several Ages to be imposed on the Catholick Church by the Bishops of *Rome* and their Partizans; but none obtained so firm Establishment and Confirmation as those ratified in this Council, which here gain'd Footing, and to this Time have generally prevail'd. The Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* had for many Years been variously acknowledg'd and refuted, but active Pope *Innocent* III. resolves to nail the Controversy, and for the future to put it beyond Dispute. In order to which, in the First Canon of this Council, they conclude upon a Confession of Faith, to be acknowledg'd by all, the former Part of which, relating to the Unity of the Trinity, General Resurrection, *&c.* is Orthodox; but the latter Part makes *Transubstantiation* an Article of Faith as much as any of the former in these Words: *The Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament is verily contained in the Bread and Wine; the Body by the Divine Power being chang'd into Bread, and the Blood into Wine; that, to compleat the Mystery of the Unity, we might receive that from him which he took of us; viz.* by his Incarnation. The Doctrine of *Transubstan-*

tiation

tiation has in all Ages, ſince it has been broach'd, been ſufficiently confuted and exploded; and therefore I ſhall not here diſſert upon it, only give this ſmall Animadverſion; *viz.* That it is as abſurd as it is profane, to make the Partakers of the Bleſſed Sacrament a Part of the Completion of the Unity; which, if granted according to this Article, is making Cannibals of Chriſtians. But as groſs as this Doctrine is, it is in the Third Canon inforc'd under Pain of Excommunication to all that refuſe it, and the like Puniſhment to thoſe that ſhall favour or protect the Recuſants, commanding all Archbiſhops, Biſhops, *&c.* to make ſtrict Search and Inquiry in their reſpective Diſtricts, and to charge the People upon Oath to diſcover ſuch Recuſants; and to ſignify the ſame to the Sovereign Pontiff, that they may be brought to condign Puniſhment; which if any Prelate ſhould neglect to do, he ſhall forthwith be depoſed, and a more fit Perſon be ſubſtituted in his Place. This was making ſure Work, and propagating Iniquity with a Vengeance.

The Second Canon condemns *Joachim* the Abbot for writing againſt the famous School-Divine *Peter Lombard*, whom he wittily explodes for making a Quaternity of the Unity and Eſſence of the Trinity, calling him Heretick and Madman. Here we may ſee the Effect of this ſublime and ſubtil Way of Reaſoning in the School-Men. *Joachim* thought himſelf as well qualified for this as *Peter Lombard*, or any of them; and therefore thinks he has an Advantage of him in his Aſperſion, with which he acquainted Pope *Innocent* III. and, no Doubt of it, he thought himſelf in the Right, and expected Applauſe from him, or he had not tranſmitted his Book to him for his Approba-

tion,

tion, as this Canon ſays. But, whether his Aſſertion againſt *Lombard* were right or not, it is plain that this new Method of Reaſoning was attended with ill Conſequences, and, in their Senſe, inſtead of curing, created Hereſies. *Almerick* of *Chartres*, who had been condemned in the Second Council of *Paris*, *A. D.* 1209. with his Followers, was condemn'd in this Canon. He was well skill'd in Logick, and as good at Diſtinctions, Diviſions, and other Niceties, as the reſt; by which he broach'd ſeveral new Opinions, which his Followers vaſtly improv'd; for which, tho' dead, he is here condemn'd, and his Body taken up and burnt.

The Third Canon is a Confirmation of the firſt, as has been ſaid, with this Addition, chiefly to exert the Supremacy, as well in Temporal as Spiritual Cauſes; That if any Temporal Prince, being requir'd by the Pope to purge his Dominion of Hereticks, ſhall neglect ſo doing, he ſhall be excommunicated. And if within the Space of a Year he ſhall refuſe Satisfaction, Notice ſhall be given to the Pope; who, for his Contempt, ſhall abſolve his Subjects from their Allegiance, and give his Land to be poſſeſs'd by Catholicks, who, extirpating the Hereticks, ſhall enjoy it without Moleſtation: Adding this ridiculous Salvo, *Saving the Right of the Prince, ſo long as he ſhall not make any Oppoſition.* Neceſſity indeed has made many Sovereign Princes acquieſce under ſuch arbitrary Sentences, but he muſt be very phlegmatick that will ſubmit to ſuch unwarrantable Diſpenſations, when he hath Power to reinſtate himſelf in his own, and expell Invaders.

The Fourth Canon crowns all former Invaſions of the *Latins* upon the *Greek* Church, challenging Obedience from the *Greeks* to the Biſhop of *Rome* as their Sovereign. How vaſtly different this is

 from

from the Usage of the Primitive Church, the Second General Council of *Constantinople*, Can. 3. the Council of *Chalcedon*, Can 28 and the Sixth General Council of *Constantinople*, Can 36. plainly demonstrate; all which agree, that the Bishop or Patriarch of *Constantinople* should have equal Honours after the Bishop of *Rome*. The Third Canon of the Council of *Constantinople* gives the Reason for this very expresly; because *Constantinople*, being the Seat of the Empire, was become *New Rome*. Which Bishop *Beveridge*, in his Note on the 28th Canon of *Chalcedon*, further explains, (though the Canon it self is plain enough, which says, "The "Bishop of *New Rome* shall enjoy the same Honour "with the Bishop of *Old Rome*, by Reason of the "Translation of the Empire.)" From hence, says he, we may observe for what Reason the Ancients paid so much Honour to the See of *Rome*; not because it was the See of St. *Peter*, or because her Bishop is Christ's Vicar; but because it was the Seat of the Empire. But the Power, which the Bishop of *Rome* had thus usurp'd over the *Greek* Church, was chiefly owing to the distracted State of the Eastern Empire, their own Divisions contributing to the Ruine of their Church and State. For *Alexius Aregalus* depriving his Brother *Isaac* both of the Empire and his Eyes, the Christian Princes, who were going with a great Force to recover the Holy Land, winter by the Way at *Constantinople*; where they besiege the Usurper *Alexius*, and take the City, from whence he escap'd. The City being taken, and the Usurper fled, the poor blind Emperor *Isaac* is by the Consent of the Princes plac'd on the Throne. And now, all Things submitting to the Will of the *Latin* Princes, Pope *Innocent* III. resolves to improve the Opportunity, who immediately introduces the Worship of the

Latin

Latin Church in *Constantinople*; and, to secure the Investiture of the Patriarchate for the future, makes one *Thomas* of *Venice* Patriarch. *Cabbasut. Not. Eccles. p.* 413. *col.* 2. Before these Advantages, the *Greek* Church was so inveterate against the *Latins*, that they refused all Manner of Communion with them; insomuch that, as is mentioned in this Fourth Canon, they would not celebrate upon the same Altars till they had wash'd them, and rebaptiz'd those that had been before baptiz'd by the *Latins*. But these prosperous Successes of the *Latin* Princes, gave new Life to the Affairs of the Bishop of *Rome*, who not only assumes Power over the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, but over all the Patriarchates of the East, as appears from the Fifth Canon of this Council. In which he not only claims Supremacy over them, but pretends an antecedent ancient Right. This Canon is written with an Air of Sovereignty, and is worth the Reader's Notice; which is *verbatim* thus: " Being de-
" sirous to revive the ancient Privileges of Patriar-
" chal Sees, with the Consent of this Holy Uni-
" versal Synod, we decree, That, after the Church
" of *Rome*, which, by the Providence of God, is
" supream above all others, as the Mother and So-
" vereign of all the Faithful of Christ, *Constanti-*
" *nople* be the First, *Alexandria* the Second, *Antioch*
" the Third, and *Jerusalem* the Fourth; allowing
" to each his Dignity in his proper District; but
" with this Reserve, that after their Bishops had re-
" ceived their PALL from the Bishop of *Rome*,
" (which is the Mark of Plenitude in the Episco-
" pal Office) and having sworn Fidelity and Obe-
" dience to him, they might freely dispose of the
" Pall to their Suffragans, receive their canonical
" Profession for themselves, and likewise the Oath
" of Obedience from them to the Church of *Rome*.

" They

" They ſhould alſo have the Crucifix carried be-
" fore them, but not in the City of *Rome*, or any
" Place where the Pope or his Legate reſided. In
" all Provinces the Right of Appeal upon Occa-
" ſion ſhould likewiſe be allow'd to them, except
" in Prejudice of the See of *Rome*, to which all
" ought to pay humble Deference.

Here indeed the ſupream Pontiff has exerted himſelf in a moſt lordly Manner, ſubjecting the Univerſal Church to his arbitrary Sway, and making all Dignities in it, (how independant ſoever they were of *Rome* before) to hold of him in moſt abject feudal Slavery; and that Primacy, which was but a meer complimental Deference paid to the See of *Rome* by other Biſhops in reſpect of her being the Firſt See, is turn'd into a Suprematical Tyranny, claiming ſervile Obedience from thoſe Prelates of other Parts of the Chriſtian Church who before were always eſteem'd equal to thoſe of *Rome*, the Biſhops of *Carthage*, particularly St. *Cyprian* and *Cæcilian*, calling them *Confratres, Coepiſcopi, & Collegæ*. But to let the World ſee in what Subjection Pope *Innocent* III. kept the Eaſtern Patriarchs, the Editors, in the Preamble to this Council, inſert Two of this Pope's Epiſtles: The Firſt is to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, wherein, ſpeaking of his Intent to call a General Council, he imperiouſly commands his perſonal Appearance in his Preſence at the Time appointed; or, if he cannot, to depute his Repreſentative; he does not ſay Legate, for that is now become a Term proper only to the Supream Biſhop's Deputy. The other is written in the ſame lofty Style to the Patriarch of *Jeruſalem*, whom in the Title he calls *Legate of the Apoſtolick See*, requiring his Preſence likewiſe at the Council, if he can come without Detriment to the Affairs of the Holy Land, and to bring proper Per-

 ſons

ſons with him to aſſiſt in it; but does not ſay, as to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, if he could not come in Perſon, to depute ſome other in his Room; his ſagacious Infallibility wiſely foreſeeing, how prepoſterouſly it would look for his Legate to ſend a Sublegate. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 129, 130.

But we'l return to the Fifth Canon aforeſaid, becauſe in it the Biſhop of *Rome* hath made but one Morſel of the Rights of the whole Chriſtian Church, which he hath gorg'd with a Vulturian Guſt. How unjuſt his Claim of Supremacy is, has been generally and particularly ſpoken to already. We have often mentioned the *Taking up of the Pall from* Rome; which, being another Innovation and Encroachment of the Grand Prelate, it may be of Uſe and Entertainment to the Reader to diſcuſs.

The PALL is the Characteriſtick Note, or Emblem of the Pope's Supremacy; for by Vertue of it all Patriarchs and Metropolitans, as they pretend, hold of *Rome*; and without it they are not to conſecrate, celebrate a Synod, or exerciſe any Pontifical Function. There is a ſhort Account of the Court of *Rome*, together with its Offices and Officers, written in *Italian*, tranſlated into *Engliſh* by Mr. *H. Cogan*, and printed for *Henry Herringman*, *A. D.* 1654, wherein the Tradition of the PALL is related, *p.* 141, *&c.* The Uſe of the PALL is there ſaid to be very ancient, having its Original from Pope *Linus*, the immediate Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, and given by God to the Prelates of *Rome* for a ſingular and ſpecial Privilege of Power. The Care of making and keeping the *Palls*, ſays the ſame Author, belongs to the Apoſtolical Subdeacons, who make them of pure and White Wool in this Manner: The Nuns of St. *Anne*'s Monaſtery do offer every Year two White Lambs on the Altar of that Church in the Feſtival Day of St. *Anne*,

of

of whose Wool the *Palls* are made, and delivered to the Subdeacons, who carry them to the Church of St. *Peter*; by the Canons of which they are laid upon the Bodies of the Apostles *Peter* and *Paul*, under the high Altar, and being watch'd one Night according to Custom, they are taken from thence, and restor'd to the Subdeacons. The Form of them is orbicular, so as to compass the Shoulders, with Labels hanging down before and behind, and on each Shoulder. When the *Pall* is conferr'd on any one, these Words are Part of the Form: *To the Honour of Almighty God, of the Blessed Virgin* Mary, *and of the Blessed Apostles* Peter *and* Paul; *and also of our Holy Father the Pope, and of the Holy Church, we give thee this Pall, taken from the Body of Blessed* Peter, *wherein is the Plenitude of the Pontifical Office, together with the Title of Archbishop, &c.* Thus far the aforesaid Author, on whom it will not be amiss to bestow an Animadversion or two.

1. As to the Antiquity of the Institution of the *Pall*, this Author deduces it from *Linus*, whom he calls the immediate Successor of St. *Peter*. But this, as we have observed in the Beginning of these Remarks, could never clearly be made out, nor can the *Romanists* plainly prove who was the immediate Successor of the Apostles in the See of *Rome*; for tho' *Irenæus* says, *The Apostles gave the Administration of the Church at* Rome *to* Linus; yet, as has been already observed, *Epiphanius*, *Hæres.* 20, gives the Reason for it, saying, *That the Apostles being gone into other Provinces to preach the Gospel of Christ*, Rome *could not be left without a Bishop*. And therefore they deputed *Linus*; which does not amount to a Succession, but a bare Temporal Deputation. But it matters not to the present Purpose, whether SS. *Peter* and *Paul* made *Linus* the first Bishop of *Rome*, whether he was the next in the Administration af-

ter St. *Peter*, or whether he died before St. *Peter*, as the Author of the Apostolick Constitutions has it, *l.* 7. *c.* 47. There is an unlucky Blunder in the Institution it self, which gives it a fatal Stab. The Author tells us, That the Care of making and keeping the *Palls* was committed to the Apostolical Subdeacons; and that they were made of the Wool shorn off the two Lambs offer'd on the Altar of the Church of St. *Anne*. Some People have but weak Memories ------ Let this Author prove, that there was such an Order as that of Subdeacons in *Linus*'s Time, or that there then was any Monastry or Church dedicated to St. *Anne* in *Rome*, as he affirms, and I will without Scruple believe this or any other *Romantick* Story he or any of his Friends can invent, be their Fancy never so prolifick.

2. There is something in the Form of the Collation of the *Pall* that carries a more modern Aspect than that of *Linus*'s Time. For these Words, *We give thee this Pall, wherein is the Plenitude of the Pontifical Office*, are *verbatim* the Words of the Fifth Canon of the Fourth *Lateran* Council; and which I dare affirm were not used in this Sense in any Institution, Canon, or Council before, which is above 1100 Years after *Linus*.

3. This Author affirms, That *Eusebius Cæsariensis*, in a Sermon of the Epiphany, writeth thus: *Nothing is more ancient than the Sacerdotal Vesture of our Prelates, which succeeded to that made of Silk and Gold in the Old Testament, wherewith* Linus *first of all was adorn'd, in Sign of plenary Power*. This smells strong of the Forge for several Reasons; 1. As to *Eusebius*'s Sermon on the Epiphany, as he calls it, he is very much besides his Authority; for this must either be among his Five Books *de Theophania*, which are reckon'd among his *Opera non extantia*, and consequently

ſequently could not come within this Author's Reach; being only known as being cited: Or elſe it muſt be among his Homilies, which are reckon'd among his *Scripta dubia*, and more juſtly eſteem'd to belong to *Euſebius Emiſenus. Cav. Hiſt. Lit. Par.* 1. *p.* 133, 134. 2. The Sacerdotal Veſture cannot be ſaid to imply a *Pall*, bearing no Relation to it. 3. The forementioned Phraſe, *Plenary Power*, carries Suſpicion enough to betray it.

Before I take Leave of this Author, there is another Thing worthy Obſervation; which however indulg'd or diſpens'd with, cannot clear the Church of *Rome* or its Biſhop from that foul Sin of direct Simony. The *Pall* being granted, *p.* 146. he adds, *They who receive it, do uſually compound with the Subdeacons, who do receive from the Prelates, ſometimes more, ſometimes leſs in the Hundred, according to the Value and Taxation of the Church.* So that according to their own Scheme, *viz.* That no Prelates can conſecrate, celebrate Synods, or perform any Epiſcopal Act, before they have taken up their *Palls*, and which cannot be obtained without a Price, they have no Title to their Dignities, and therefore muſt conſequently be guilty of Simony. It may be urg'd perhaps in Defence of the Supream Pontiff, that this Price is no more than a Fee due to the Subdeacons as Officials in the Court of *Rome*; but our Author clears that Point, by adding, that, *The Maſters of the Ceremonies too, in regard of their Office, and the drawing up of the Inſtrument, have certain Fees, according to the Proportion of the Value, and Taxation of the Churches, but not ſo much as the Subdeacons. Ibid.* The Maſters of the Ceremonies indeed ought to be conſidered for their Trouble in drawing up Inſtruments, and the Fees appropriated to them are as much their Due as a Labourer's Hire; but Subdeacons are not to be reckon'd in

the Number of Hirelings or menial Servants; and being Clericks, cannot give or take Money on the Score of any Ecclesiastical Promotion without Imputation of Simony.

But the honest Sorbonist *Richerius*, in his History of the General Councils, *L.* 1. *p.* 381. *&c.* makes this Encroachment of the Bishops of *Rome* a much viler Usurpation than has hitherto been represented, the Institution of the *Pall* being not originally theirs. How unconformable to the ancient Canons the later and more modern Innovations of the See of *Rome* are, may be clearly evinc'd from the Canons themselves. The Sixth Canon of the First *Nicene* Council allots to each Patriarch his Rights over his Metropolitans; and that no Person shall be acknowledged a Bishop who is not consecrated by his proper Metropolitan. The Right also of Patriarchs ordaining Metropolitans is enforc'd from this and the Canons of other Councils, particularly that of *Chalcedon*, *Can.* 12. wherein the Rights of both are preserv'd, which mediately or immediately is to be understood according to the Order prescrib'd by the Canons, or other ancient prevailing Custom. Now, says *Richerius*, the Manner of ordaining Metropolitans was by Imposition of Hands; which Custom deduces its Origin from the Gospel: But when and whence the Grant of the *Pall* in the Church had its Institution, does no where appear. They would seem to describe the *Pall* from *Isidore Pelensiora*, *L.* 1. *Ep.* 136. to *Hermin*; where he says, *The little Cloak or Mantle which the Priest wore on his Shoulders was made of Wool, not of Linen; signifying thereby the Fleece of that Sheep which its Master found wandering, and laid on his Shoulders; and emblematically implying, that a Bishop, who bears the Type of Christ, should discharge his Office, and, being cloathed with that Habit, shew to all, that he imitates that good and great*

Shepherd

Shepherd who bore the Infirmities of his Flock. It likewise appears from the same *Isidore*, that not only the Metropolitans in *Greece*, but the Bishops, used this Sort of Cloak or Mantle: But what's this to the Concession of the *Pall*? The Authors of the fabulous Donation of *Constantine* say, *That the Emperor* Constantine *gave to Pope* Silvester *his Superhumerale or Hood which he wore upon his Shoulders; which seems to be a Resemblance or Species of the Pall.* But every like is not the same. However, supposing this Donation to be true, (though it is an apparent direct Forgery) it makes against the original Grant of it in the Pope; for the true Inference from this Citation is, that the Concession of the *Pall* was from the Emperor to the Pope. *Baronius* in his Annals, *Tome* V. *ad An.* 432. towards the End, mentions a Privilege of the Church of *Ravenna*, which by the Emperor *Valentinian* was erected into a Metropolis, and that he granted the Use of the *Pall* to *John* Bishop thereof: Which Privilege *Baronius* most furiously opposes; affirming, That the Grant of the *Pall* belongs to the Pope, and not to the Emperor. This is asserting, but not proving; and taking that for granted which is still in Dispute. I do not deny, says *Richerius*, that the Bishops of *Rome*, from the Time of *Gregory the Great*, have practised the Grant of the *Pall* to Metropolitans; but the Controversy in Hand is about the First Institution of it, and whether the Concession of it was from the Emperors, or from the Church? He must be very ignorant of History, who will deny, that the Emperors have erected Metropolis's; and therefore *Baronius* is very much in the wrong to oppose this Privilege of the *Pall* granted by *Valentinian* to the Church of *Ravenna*. *Liberatus*, in his History, which he calls his *Breviary*, *cap.* 21. relates, *That when* Anthimus *found he must quit the*

See of Conſtantinople, *be return'd the Pall to the Emperors.* From whence it is plain, that the Emperors beſtowed the *Pall* on the Patriarchs. And for this Reaſon, I ſuppoſe, *Gregory, L.* 1. *Ep.* 27. ſays, *That he importuned the Emperor* Maurice, *to permit the Uſe of the Pall to* Anaſtaſius *Patriarch of* Antioch, *that he might celebrate Maſs in the Church of St.* Peter, *Prince of the Apoſtles* To what Purpoſe ſhould Pope *Gregory* petition the Emperor to grant the Uſe of the *Pall* to *Anaſtaſius*, if the Emperor had not the Right of diſpoſing of it? And as for granting Leave to *Anaſtaſius* to celebrate Maſs in St. *Peter*'s Church, it was undoubtedly in Pope *Gregory*'s own Power; but the Uſe of the *Pall* could be granted only by the Emperor. From hence it is beyond Controverſy, That the Inſtitution of the *Pall* was firſt in the Emperors; the Diſpoſing of which, as the Empire declin'd, the Biſhops of *Rome* aſſumed, as they did many other Things. Upon which ſeveral Innovations and Encroachments crept in immediately, and the old Canonical Inſtitutions were inverted. The ancient Cuſtom of Patriarchs was ſoon after their Conſecration to ſend Synodical Letters of their Ordination and Profeſſion of their Faith to other Patriarchs; but the *Roman* Pontiffs, by ſending the *Pall* to Metropolitans, imperiouſly demand of them an Account of their Faith. This crept in ſo early as with Pope *Pelagius* I. who pleads the Uſe of the *Pall*; complaining, that Metropolitans refuſed to give any Account of their Faith to him, or accept the *Pall* from him: Upon which he decrees, *That whoſoever ſhall not within the Space of Six Months do both, ſhall be deprived.* *Gregory* the *Great*, though a Supplicant to the Emperor *Maurice* for the Uſe of the *Pall* for the Patriarch of *Antioch*, takes upon him to diſpoſe of a *Pall* to a Biſhop of *Corinth*, who was no Subject to the Patriarch of *Rome*;

Rome; which could be no more at that Time than paying a Compliment to a Bishop in Possession before, without the Authority or Power of the See of *Rome*: But these early Encroachments furnish them with Precedents; and from them they plead, That so long since such and such a Bishop received his *Pall* from the *Roman* Patriarch. But in the Time of *Gregory* VII. the ancient Use of the *Pall* is changed from what it was in Pope *Paschal* and *Gregory* the *Great*'s Time: Then it was to give an Account of their Faith, but now it is employed as an Instrument to exact an Oath of Fidelity and Obedience from the Metropolitans to the Bishop of *Rome*: The Neglect of which made *Gregory* VII. *L.* 1. *Ep.* 9. very angry with the Archbishop of *Roan*; commanding him not to ordain any Bishop or Priest, or consecrate any Church, till he had taken his *Pall* from *Rome*, according to the Custom of the Apostolick See. The same likewise Pope *Paschal* II. claims: So that we may justly infer from hence, what was originally given as a Mark of Honour and Dignity, is by long Practice grown a heavy Burden; the Court of *Rome* forbidding Metropolitans the Execution of their Office, which they are by Divine Right obliged to perform, till they had taken up their *Pall*; which at best is but meerly a Ceremonial, contributing nothing to the Episcopal Function. But in succeeding Ages, by this Ceremony of the *Pall*, the Bishops of *Rome* not only subdued the *Western*, but the *Eastern* Churches to the Monarchy of the *Roman* Pontiff, as appears plainly in the Fifth Canon of the Fourth *Lateran* Council; which makes it the Plenitude of the Pontifical Office.

In Order to the utter Extirpation of the *Albigenses* and *Vaudois*, there were Two Things instituted, or at least confirmed, in this Council; and which

which seem to take their Rise from Two Canons of it, *viz.* the Office of Inquisition from the Eighth, and the Order of Preachers from the Ninth; tho' the Project is chiefly owing to *Dominic* of *Spain*, a Regular of the Church of *Osme*, who was present at this Council, and treated with great Respect by Pope *Innocent* III. This *Dominic* having form'd the Design of the Order of Preachers, gets it confirmed in this Council: The Intent of which was to train up a certain Number of Men, who by their powerful Oratory should be able to convince the *Albigenses*, and convert them, and all other Hereticks. But suspecting their own Abilities, an armed Force was sent to subdue them, under the Name of *Croysades*; and to crown this pious Work, they set up the Office of the *Holy Inquisition*, that Scandal and Scourge of the Christian Religion, that Rack of Consciences, and Shop of Cruelty and Butchery. *Ludovicus a Paramo*, who was an Inquisitor, in his Book *de Orig. Officii S. Inquisit. l.* 1. *tit.* 2. *c.* 1. most ridiculously lays the Foundation of it in Paradise, making God the First Inquisitor, and our First Parents by their Fall guilty of Heresy: And least this pretty Story should want Embellishment, he tells us, That after the Great Inquisitor had condemn'd them in a formal Manner, he enjoin'd them a Pennance, which they perform'd, wearing Leathern Garments; in Imitation of which, the *Benedictines* afterwards wore the *Sanbenito*. He might much more properly have made *Adam* the Author of Open-knee'd Breeches. This wretched Fabulosity is downright playing with holy Things, and making a prophane Jest of Religion. The *Inquisition* having been treated of by several Hands, I shall only add here, that it was first set up at *Toulouse*, and in other Cities of *Languedoc*, where the *Albigenses* and *Vaudois* had gotten the deepest Footing.

ing. The Popes ſet it up in *Italy*, from whence a long Time after it paſs'd into *Spain*; but it was baniſh'd *France*, and could never be brought into *Germany*; though the Emperor *Frederic* II. did protect the Inquiſitors, allowing them to take Cognizance of the Crime of Hereſy; but he left the Power of puniſhing to the Laity.

The Forty ſeventh and Forty eighth Canons of this Council relate to Church-Diſcipline, particularly Excommunication, and the Conſequences of it: In the End of which there is a particular Exception in Favour of Regulars, who are exempted from Cenſures of this Nature, as having ſpecial Rules of Diſcipline among themſelves. By this the old Encroachment of the Monaſtick State upon the Epiſcopal is revived and confirmed, diſcharging Regulars from the Juriſdiction of their Dioceſans. The Fifty ſeventh Canon is another Inſtance of the Pope's Partiality and Favour to the Monks or Regulars, who, out of their own Order, own no Superior but the Pope: For which he favourably diſtinguiſhed them from the Secular Clergy, nay, from the Biſhops themſelves. They are in this Canon allowed, upon their annual Circuits when they go to receive their Rents, to celebrate Divine Service in the Church of the Place, though it be actually under Interdict; calling their Arrival in ſuch a Place *Jucundus Adventus*. But in the Fifty eighth Canon, a Biſhop that ſhall happen to come into any Place where the Church is under Interdict, his Arrival is ſo far from being called *Jucundus*, that though he is allowed to celebrate in the Church, yet it is with theſe Reſtrictions: *He ſhall cauſe the Church-Doors to be ſhut, ſpeak with a low Voice, allow no Bells to be rung; and if there be any ſpecial Prohibition enjoin'd, he ſhall not preſume to celebrate.* But there are none of theſe Cautions and Reſtrictions

ſtrictions on the Regulars: They cannot be thought to err, or incur an Interdict. I ſhall add but a few Words more of this Council, or the Pope that preſided in it, both which expired in a ſhort Time after each other. Notwithſtanding the many and conſiderable Advantages Pope *Innocent* III. gain'd in this Council to the Papal Dignity, and the great (though wicked) Points he maintained and carried, and though this Council is call'd General, yet there are ſtrong Preſumptions which detract very much from the Credit and Authority of it. 1. The Canons of this Council carry not the leaſt Shadow of Synodical Authority with them, but look more like the arbitrary Pragmatick Decrees of Pope *Innocent*, than any joint Conſent of a Synod; aſſuming to himſelf in the Style of them the Power of Indulging, Can. 57. Calling the Biſhop of *Rome* the *Plenitude of Power*, Can. 62. *&c.* All which carry an Air of Sovereignty in them, belonging to the Pope more than the Synod. 2. Conſidering the great and illuſtrious Appearance in this Council, which conſiſted of 412 Biſhops, among whom were Two Patriarchs, *viz.* of *Conſtantinople* and *Jeruſalem*, (though both of them *Latins*) 71 Primates and Metropolitans, and 800 Abbots and Priors, it might reaſonably have been expected, that the Decrees of this Synod ſhould have been confirmed by a general Subſcription; but there is not the Name of one ſubſcribed to them. This the Learned *Du Pin* makes appear very plain in his *Diſſert.* 7. § 4. *de Antiquit. Eccleſ. Diſciplin.* and likewiſe in *Vol.* XI. *p.* 103. upon this Council, he ſays: "Hiſtorians tell us of ſeveral Matters, which were "regulated by this Council, but rather by the "Pope." So that from hence we may infer, the Canons of this Council look more like the arbitra-

ry

ry Acts of Pope *Innocent* III. than the Decrees of the Bishops here assembled.

[1216.] *Centius Sabellius*, Cardinal-Priest, succeeds *Innocent* III. by the Name of *Honorius* III. He was a strenuous Promoter of Expeditions to the Holy-Land, and against the *Albigenses*, *Vaudois*, *&c.* In the First of which he succeeded, by the Help of a pretended Vision of St. *Peter*, who by Revelation foretold the speedy Reducing of *Jerusalem*. *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 1. *p.* 242. In the other he disputes with various Success for several Years, till *Raimond* Count of *Tolouse*, and others, who had headed the *Albigenses*, were forced to submit, which was about the Year 1225. when, in the Council of *Bourges*, *Raimond* had his Lands restor'd; having the Year before, in the Council of *Mompellier*, taken an Oath to live peaceably, to pay Obedience to the Church of *Rome*, to restore the Clergy their Rights, and within the Space of Three Months to pay Fifteen thousand Marks for Damages done; and, to the utmost of his Power, to extirpate Heresy throughout his whole Province. This Pope, well knowing from the Practice of his Predecessors of what vast Advantage the Preservation of the Holy-Land was to the See of *Rome*, resolves to forward the Expedition thither with all his Interest; and therefore commands the Emperor *Frederick*, under Pain of Excommunication, to march an Army thither, notwithstanding the Necessity of his own Affairs to the contrary; which he delaying to do, his Holiness is as good as his Word, (he or his Predecessors seldom failing in this Case) and forthwith excommunicates him. But this Matter the Editors, *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 301. in their Account of the Council of *Cremona*, seem to set in a true Light. Out of the *Turen* Chronicle they tell us, That *A. D.* 1226. the Emperor *Frederick* held a

Council

Council at *Cremona* about the Extirpation of the Hereticks out of *Italy*, and about the Affairs of the Holy-Land: But the Cities of *Italy*, confederating upon his Approach, refused to obey or receive him; so that he was forced to retire to *Appulia, re infectâ*. Here was the true Cause of his Holiness's Displeasure; not so much the Affair of the Holy-Land, which he would by no Means have neglected: But the Emperor's holding a Council about these Affairs without his Consent, and in *Italy* too, swells the Stomach of the Supreme Pontiff. The Sovereign Bishop never car'd to have an Emperor in *Rome*, or any Part of *Italy*, unless it were to set their Feet upon the Shoulders of him. The Emperor's Approach gives the Alarm to the Holy See, which, like a Beacon, warns the Ecclesiastick State of the Invader's Coming, and to arm against him: Though the Emperor was ever so much in earnest in the Case of extirpating Hereticks, or going to the Holy-Land, yet his setting Foot in *Italy*, and holding a Council without the Pope's Consent, was an Infringement the Court of *Rome* could not digest: It was treading upon the Toes of the Supremacy, in presuming to do what formerly had been their Right, though now alter'd.

This Year, *viz.* 1226. is very remarkable for a bold Attempt of the Bishop of *Rome* upon all Ecclesiastick Dignities. It begun in *England*; and had it succeeded there, would, no Doubt, have been received every where else; which would have mede the *Servus Servorum* the most wealthy Potentate upon Earth. But *Henry* III. King of *England*, wisely foreseeing the Consequence, handsomely diverted it. *Matthew Paris* relates it thus: "*Stephen Langton*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, calling a Council at *Westminster*, caus'd the Pope's "Letters concerning the Conferring of Benefices

"on the Bishop of *Rome*, to be read before the "King and Prelates of *England*; which they no "sooner understood, but all began to reflect on "the Covetousness of the *Romans*. The King, "calling the Prelates and Nobility together, re-"turn'd this Answer to the Archbishop: What the "Pope demands of us relates to the Christian "World in general: We therefore, who are situ-"ated at so great a Distance, when we shall see "how other Nations receive these Demands, shall "by their Example be the more ready to answer "them." But the foresaid Author pursues this Story more at large, giving the Reason for the Pope's Demand. "Cardinal *Otho*, the Pope's Le-"gate, alledging the Scandal that the Church of "*Rome* laboured under by being so dilatory in her "Proceedings, that none could have their Business "dispatched in the Court of *Rome* without a vast "Expence of Money and Presents; and that the "Poverty of the Church of *Rome* was the Cause "of this Scandal, tells them they ought, as dutiful "Sons, to take off this Scandal; for unless they "received Presents from such good Men as they "were, they should want the common Necessaries "of Life, which would be very unbecoming the "*Roman* Dignity. If therefore they would con-"sent to this Demand, they would not only re-"move this Reproach from their Mother the "Church, but might also have Justice done them "in the Dispatch of their Affairs without the usual "Presents." The Form of the Demand runs thus: *We demand of all Cathedral Churches Two Prebends to be conferr'd on us, one from the Portion of the Bishop, and another of the Chapter: Likewise of Religious Houses, where there are distinct Portions of the Abbots and the Convents, we demand the Portion of one Monk, and as much of the Abbot.* This would have been a delicious

cious Morſel out of the Revenues of the Church of *England*; but in other Countries it would have amounted to an immenſe Sum. But notwithſtanding the preſſing Inſtances of the Cardinal-Legate, the Deſign was baffled by many Delays and Diſappointments, which were on Purpoſe thrown in the Way to oppoſe this exorbitant and unreaſonable Demand. At which Cardinal *Baronius*, *Spondanus*, and others, are not a little angry, hinting, that there were not wanting ſuch malign Diſpoſitions, as always oppos'd ſo great a Good.

The Firſt Epiſtle of this Pope is to *Henry* III. King of *England*; and though we cannot for Want of Date tell when it was written, yet by the Manner of it we may reaſonably ſuppoſe it deſigned to prepare that Prince to encourage the forementioned Demand. He embraces him with a ſpecial Affection, as his moſt beloved Son, applauds his early pious Inclinations to the Fear of God, and virtuous Diſpoſition, and obliges him to an humble Veneration of the Church and her Miniſters.

The Second Epiſtle is to the Biſhops of *England*, in the Caſe of *Richard* Biſhop of *Durham*, a Man of moſt ſcandalous Life: In which, having enumerated many heavy Crimes charged on him, ſuch as Murder, Simony, Adultery, Sacrilege, Perjury, *&c.* he likewiſe accuſes him of not paying Deference to Appeals to the See of *Rome*. Had the Biſhop of *Durham* been innocent of all the other Crimes alledged againſt him, this alone had been enough to have condemned him. But after he has reckon'd up the ſeveral Parts of the Accuſation, in a moſt profane and arrogant Manner, he aſſumes the Style of the Moſt High almoſt to a Letter. *Cum adeo ad nos Clamor ſuper his aſcenderit, dignum duximus ex Officii noſtri Debito deſcendere, ut hæc an ita ſint vel aliter, videamus.* Con. T. 11. par. 1. p. 243.

Becauſe

Because the Cry of these Things is come up to us, we have thought fit, according to the Duty of our Office, to go down, that we may know whether these Things are so or not. How prophane this Expression in a Mortal is, though a Sovereign Pontiff, let the Impartial judge, by comparing it with this Text, *Gen.* 18 *v.* 20, 21. *Because the Cry of* Sodom *and* Gomorrah *is great, and because their Sin is exceeding grievous, I will go down now and see, whether they have done altogether according to the Cry which is come unto me, and if not, that I may know.* To imitate God in all Things is impossible, and in many Things unlawful, as when our Imitation presumes to make us equalize our selves with God. The grand Prelate in this Expression makes a wrong Use of the Keys, in presuming to assimilate his Power to that of the Great God; amongst whose Perfections there is not one proposed for our Imitation, but his Goodness: He never commanded us to follow his Example, but in this one Virtue: *Be ye holy, as I am holy.* Levit. 11. 44, 45. *Be ye merciful, as your Father also is merciful.* Luk. 6. 36. Had this proud Ecclesiastick Monarch consulted St. *Austin* on those Words of our Blessed Saviour, *Learn of me, &c.* they might have check'd his Presumption. *Non dicit, discite a me Mundum fabricare, non cuncta visibilia & invisibilia creare, non in ipso Mundo mirabilia facere, sed quoniam mitis sum & humilis Corde. He doth not say, learn of me to build the curious and stately Fabrick of the World, to create all Things visible and invisible therein contained; no, but learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of Heart.* Sovereignity and Power are not the Inheritance of our Lord to his Spouse the Church, and his Children the Clergy. To trample upon the Backs of Kings, and deliver them over to Satan upon every secular Caprice, comes short of the Indulgence of a Spiritual Father: And to sacrifice that Flock to sordid Avarice and

 Ambition,

Ambition, which Chrift ranfom'd with his Blood, is very unbecoming the Character of a true Paftor. But thefe have too often been the Marks of Scandal in the Bifhops of *Rome*, as already has been obferved, and will more infamoufly appear in many following Inftances; and in none more than in the fucceeding Pope.

[1227.] *Gregory* IX. before call'd *Hugoline*. He was Nephew to *Innocent* III. by whom he was created Cardinal, and whofe Steps for the promoting the Intereft of the Pontificate he moft exactly trod in. The Empire and the Pontificate had for many Ages caft a jealous Eye on each other; each concluding, that nothing could fo much contribute to the Eftablifhing of the others Greatnefs, as its Rival's Deftruction; which made them ftrike fo heartily at one another, their vigorous and frequent Attacks continually involving the Empire, both in *Germany* and *Italy*, in Blood. But what contributed chiefly to the Advancement of the Pontificate, and Depreffion of the Empire, were thefe Two Things: 1. The Collection and Publication of the Decretals (in which this Pope was perfonally active, being generally fuppos'd to be the Compiler of the Decretal) gave the laft Blow towards the Ruine of the ancient Laws, and eftablifhing the abfolute and unlimited Power of Proceffes, which were afterwards brought before the Court of *Rome*. 2. The Differences of the Princes of *Germany*, in the Election of the Emperor, gave the Popes an Opportunity of maintaining this Right over the Empire, and of ftrengthening their Temporal Power in *Italy*.

The Editors in this Pope's Life are very tender, not relating the moft minute Circumftance that may fully his Character; though his Actions were as black as any of his Predeceffors, but continue

to

to inveigh ſeverely againſt the Emperor *Frederic*, and other Enemies of the Papacy. In the Beginning of his Pontificate, Pope *Gregory* IX. commands the Emperor, upon Pain of Excommunication, to lead an Army into *Aſia*; in which being retarded by Sickneſs, the impatient Pontiff forthwith anathematizes him. The Emperor no ſooner recovers, but, without his Holineſs's Abſolution, he prepares for the Holy-Land. Whether the Pope was affronted at the Emperor's Undertaking this Expedition without his Abſolution, or whether he was glad of the Opportunity his Abſence offer'd, I will not ſay: But it is certain the pious Pope takes hold of the Occaſion, and invades the Emperor's Territories in *Lombardy*, and other Parts of *Italy*; which he claims and ſeizes, as the Patrimony of the Church. It was a foul Action indeed, to invade the Dominions of an abſent Prince, at that Time hazarding his own and the Lives of his People in Defence of the Church of Chriſt, againſt a powerful Army of Infidels: But the ſubſequent Actions of this Pope ſhew him the greateſt Infidel of his Time; for, whether through Envy at the Emperor's Succeſs in the Eaſt, or Apprehenſion of his growing Greatneſs, which might afterwards eclipſe the Papal Grandeur, (no Matter which, for neither can excuſe the Baſeneſs of the Action) he moſt treacherouſly conſpires with the Knights-Templers to deſtroy the Emperor: To compleat which impious Deſign, he writes to the *Soldan* of the *Saracens*, inſtructing him how he might ſurprize *Frederic* upon the Banks of *Jordan*. The generous *Soldan* abhorring ſuch Perfidy, not only acquaints the Emperor with the Conſpiracy, but ſends him the Pope's very Letters, which were an undeniable Teſtimony of his Holineſs's Treachery. The Editors give not the leaſt Hint of this Part of

the Story, but fall to railing moſt furiouſly againſt the Emperor, for having, after his great Succeſs in *Aſia*, and taking *Jeruſalem*, made a Peace with the *Soldan* without the Conſent and Knowledge of the Princes. *Con. T. par.* 1. *p.* 310. He did make a Peace with the *Soldan*, and indeed it was high Time; for how could that Prince be ſaid to be ſafe, when the Biſhop of *Rome*, who ought to have protected his Dominions in his Abſence, baſely diſpoſſed him of them, and at a Diſtance engaged in a villainous Conſpiracy againſt his Life? Which he had inevitably loſt, but for the Generoſity of an honeſt Heathen, whoſe Morals by this Action far outſhined the Profeſſion of Chriſtianity in this Infidel-Pope; and for the Ten Years Peace, as the Editors call it, it was not only prudent, but generous and grateful in him. For in the firſt Place, it was Time for him to return to recover his Dominions, which the Pope had raviſhed from him in his Abſence: Next, he could not propoſe any Security to his Perſon among ſuch Devotees of the *Roman* Prelate's Ambition, as the Templers, who, though they had taken upon them the Croſs, yet fought and conſpired againſt the Intereſt of it. And laſtly, the generous Act of the *Soldan*, in diſcovering the treacherous Conſpiracy againſt his Life, demanded this grateful Return, though it had been upon hard Terms, which this was not. But though the Editors ſay nothing of theſe vile Actions in this Pope's Life, yet in the Two Epiſtles of Pope *Gregory*, *viz.* XI. and XII. *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 1. *p.* 337, & 340. *&c.* he charges the Emperor with the blackeſt Calumny that can be invented; eſpecially in the latter, where, to the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* and his Suffragans, he makes a diſmal Complaint of the unjuſt Charge of the Emperor, but does not clear himſelf of any Part

of

of it, any more than by downright denying some of it. After several hard Names, he tells them, how the Emperor had belied him, in saying he had relinquish'd him because he went to the Holy-Land without having sued for Absolution; and that by holding a Correspondence with the *Soldan* of the *Saracens*, he had prevented his Success in Recovery of the Holy-Land. Now, as heavy as this Charge is, the Pope does not alleviate it by any tolerable Answer; for he says, *ibid. p.* 341. "That he, (*viz.* "the Emperor) despising the Authority of the "Keys, enters *Syria* without having first received "Absolution; where between him and the *Soldan* "a Truce was agreed upon for Six Years." All this is true, and yet no Scandal on the Emperor, nor Excuse for the Pope's corresponding with an Infidel Prince against a Christian. Such weak Defences do but confirm an Accusation; and his Holiness had as good have said nothing, since he speaks so little to the Purpose. But the great Design of these two Epistles aforesaid is to wheedle the King of *England* into the Pope's Interest against the Emperor.

The Epistle of *Germanus*, who styles himself Archbishop, not Patriarch of *Constantinople*, is the most fulsome and prophane Piece of Flattery that ever was penn'd by a *Roman* Parasite, and so very unlike a Patriarch of the *Greek* Church, by the Concessions of unlimited Supremacy to that of the *Romish*, that it cannot gain Credit enough with the ingenuous to be look'd upon as genuine, but rather foisted in as a Confirmation of the Acknowledgment of the Supremacy from a Patriarch of *Constantinople*. This appears plainer yet from the two Epistles of Pope *Gregory* IX. in Answer to this of *Germanus*, which is written in the very same Style and Air, and in the same Phrase, confirming the

Conceſſions and Acknowledgments of *Germanus*; only *Gregory* in the Second (which is the Sixth in Number, *ib. p.* 325.) enlarges the Power of the Keys ſomewhat beyond what *Germanus* does in his; who only calling the Sword of Anathematization a Two-edg'd Sword, *ib. p.* 219, Pope *Gregory* fearing that Expreſſion of *Germanus* ſhould not ſufficiently be underſtood, takes upon him to add to and explain it from a Text of Scripture. "There are "two Swords, ſays he, which the Lord thought "fit, for the reſtraining of Spiritual and Corporal "Offences. If you grant the material (or *Corpo-* "*ral*) Sword to belong to the Temporal Power, "mark what our Lord ſays to *Peter* in *Mat.* 26. 52. "*Put up thy Sword into his Place.* Where by the "Word, *thy*, he meant the material Sword. And "as to the Spiritual Sword, no Body queſtions "that by Special Commiſſion he gave the Power "of Binding and Looſing to St. *Peter*. Therefore "both Swords are deliver'd to the Church, one "to be exercis'd by the Prieſt, the other by the "Soldier according to the Direction of the Prieſt." What a ridiculous Inference is here, and how unfair is it to deduce an Original of Power from a curt and imperfect Text? Without Doubt the Sword with which St. *Peter* ſmote the High-Prieſt's Servant was his own, and therefore no Emphaſis belongs to the Pronoun *Thy* more than to any other Word in the ſame Sentence. But the Context (which his Infallibilily over-look'd or was ignorant of) puts the whole beyond Diſpute. *Put up thy Sword into his Place, for they which take the Sword ſhall periſh by the Sword.* Now, if they will derive their Power of the Temporal Sword from this Text, they take it with a Curſe; and indeed it has literally proved ſo wherever they have uſed it. But from both Text and Context it is plain, our

Sa-

Saviour forbad the Use of the Civil Sword to his Disciples, and consequently to their Followers and Successors; and the more to restrain them from it, he threatens them with the Punishment of *Perishing by it.* As to the *Power of Binding and Loosing*, which, he says, by special Commission is appropriated to *Peter*, the Infallible Judge is as much out as in the other. I readily grant that our Blessed Lord, *Mat.* 16. 19. gave the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to *Peter*, and likewise the Power of binding and loosing: But doth this imply that he gave it to him only? Certainly not. And it's plain that he gave the same Power to the rest of his Disciples, from that of St. *John* 20. 22, 23. —— *Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retained.* Our Lord did not say, Receive thou the Holy Ghost, *&c.* in the singular Number; but receive *Ye* the Holy Ghost, whose Sins *Ye* remit, and whose Sins *Ye* retain. Which Dispensation was equally bestow'd on them all, without Reserve or Restraint.

But before we part with *Germanus*'s Epistle to this Pope, there is a prophane Passage in it, which renders it very suspicious; and, by its Similitude to that of Pope *Honorius* III. to the Bishops of *England*, carries a Note of Forgery by some Creature of the Pontificate in it. After an Invocation of, and Supplication to the Blessed Jesus, he addresses himself to the Pope in these Words. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 318. " Having first lifted up our " Eyes to the Heavenly Mount, from whence we " have pray'd for Help, we next apply our selves " to Thee most Holy Father, who possessest the " Primacy of the Apostolick See, that thou " wouldst descend from the Height of Glory " to hearken to the Words of me a wretched

'f Creature." This Expression is so very like the foresaid Pontifical Arrogance, that it seems but a Copy or Transcript from it; and cannot by any reasonable Man be allow'd to be the genuine Sense of a Patriarch of the *Greek* Church, which never yet made such mean Concessions and Applications to the Patriarch of *Rome* upon any Occasion whatsoever, but rather insisted on her own Rights and Prerogative in Opposition to *Rome*.

I shall make but one Remark on these Epistles before I leave them, except what shall casually fall in the Way during the Pontificate of this Pope. Pope *Gregory* in his Fifth Epistle to *Germanus*, *ib.* p. 322. very inauspiciously stumbles upon an ancient Mistake of Pope *Anacleto*'s, who derives the Word *Cephas* (which is the *Syriac* Name of *Peter*, signifying a Stone) from the *Greek* Word χεφαλη; which Pope *Gregory* IX. in this Epistle confirms by this Allusion. *As the Perfection or Plenitude of the Senses is contained in the Head, from which every Part, as a Stream from its Fountain, is by Secret Ducts deriv'd:* Proving St. *Peter*'s Supremacy by this silly Mistake.

The rest of this Epistle attempts to prove St. *Peter*'s Supremacy in Opposition to that of St. *Paul*, from the above-mentioned Texts out of St. *Matthew* and St. *John*, which have already been sufficiently refuted.

A. D. 1229, Cardinal *Romanus*, Pope *Gregory*'s Legate, presided in the Council of *Tolouse*, the first Twelve Canons of which relate particularly to the Inquisition and its Power. The Fourteenth strictly forbids the Laity the Use of any Books of the Holy Scriptures, except the Psalms, and their own Breviary; which, that they might the less understand, they are forbidden in the vulgar Tongue. But this was with Design, as they pretend, to prevent the Growth of Heresy; tho' in Truth it was

to

to oblige the Laity to an implicit Dependance on their whimsical Expositions, and disingenuous Interpretations of Holy Writ, and chiefly to suppress the *Albingenses* and *Vaudois*, whose Leader *Peter Waldius*, in the 12th Century, had begun to expound the *New Testament* to the People in the vulgar Tongue, and from thence instructed them in sound Principles of Faith, and true Moral Doctrine. But the World, according to this Canon, must remain still in Darkness, and receive no Benefit of that Gospel-Light which the Son of God intended for the Relief of all Mankind. There have been and are still too many, who uncall'd officiously take upon them to interpret the Holy Scripture, and very often through Ignorance or Mal-Intention pervert the Sense to their vile Purposes; but to deprive the Laity utterly of the Use of them, is as wild an Extream as the other, and of as dangerous Consequence.

The Inquisition having by Degrees in several Councils gain'd Strength, but chiefly from the Diploma of the supream Pontiff to all of them, did not appear in its full Force and Vigour till the Third Council of *Narbonne*, which was held *A. D.* 1235. The Second Council of *Tolouse*, *A. D.* 1229, in the first Canon appoints the Number of the Inquisitors, *viz.* One Priest, and Two, Three, or more Laymen, as Occasion shall offer. The Second Council of *Arles*, *A. D.* 1234. Can. 5. says the same; and other Councils are very indulgent to the Growth of this Shop of Cruelty. But the Third Council of *Narbonne* gives it the finishing Stroke; tho' it might more properly be said to be done by Pope *Gregory* IX.'s Mandate. For tho' the Editors, in the Inscription before the Canons of this Council, would have us believe, that this was

wholly their Act, without any Inducement or Instigation of another, directing thus: "*Peter* by the "Grace of God of *Narbonne*, *John* of *Arles*, *Raimund* "of *Aix*, Archbishops, and their Suffragans, to the "beloved and faithful Sons in Christ, the Brothers-"Inquisitors of the Order of Preachers, greeting. *Con. T. Par.* 1. *p.* 488. Yet it is plain from *Spondanus*'s Continuation of *Baronius*, *T.* 1. *ad An.* 1233. that it was the immediate Mandate of Pope *Gregory* IX. who first instituted the Brothers-Preachers Inquisitors. That Author is plain: *Mandato accepto a Sede Apostolica de Concilio impertiendo Fratribus Prædicatoribus, recens in illis Partibus constitutis Inquisitoribus contra Hæreticos quomodo se gerere adversus eos deberent* 29 *Capitula condiderunt de Pœnis, &c.* From whence it appears, that the Fathers of this Council had received Orders and Instructions from the See of *Rome* what to do, and how to behave themselves against the Hereticks, which they were to impart to the Brothers Preachers, who were by this Mandate constituted Inquisitors. The 29 Chapters or Canons of this Council are but so many Dictates from the Pope, several of which intimate as much; more particularly the Second, which forbids Hereticks being allow'd by the Inquisitors to transport themselves any where beyond Sea, *according to the Pope's Prohibition.* And the Seventh, which allows the Inquisitors to add to, or diminish the Pennances of Hereticks, as they shall think fit, *according to the Power committed to them by the Church of* ROME. And many others to the same Purpose. So that this Order of Preachers, who are by these Canons of this Council confirm'd Inquisitors in these Parts, received their primary Institution from the Pope, and which is only transmitted to them here by the Fathers of this Council;

cil; but undoubtedly with this Design, to make these Prelates thus consenting the Instruments of conveying this Power to the Inquisitors over themselves, when any of them shall act in Opposition to the Interest of the Apostolick See. Fatal Experience has too often explain'd this to be a Project of the Court of *Rome* to establish their usurp'd Supremacy; for in those Countries where the Inquisition has been establish'd, the ancient Orthodox Methods of Canonical Processes have been laid aside, and the lawful Power of Councils hath been forced to submit to the arbitrary Determination of a few Regulars, who, according to the Practice of the purest and most primitive Times, were Subordinates in a very low Degree to Metropolitan and Diocesan Bishops. Thus the Aristocracy of the Church was dissolv'd; and *Rome*, which was but a Part of the whole, and for many Ages but mean, became Head, by these and other Encroachments and Usurpations. And although the 13th Canon of this Council reserves a Power to the Bishop of *Rome* of absolving and imposing Pennances on those obstinate Offenders who shall favour Hereticks, or neglect to perform Pennances injoin'd; yet the Inquisitors of later Times have extended their Power so far, as to threaten the very Monarch of the Church with it, in the Person of Pope *Innocent* XI. for favouring *Molinos the Quietist*. The latter Part of the 29th Canon is a Confirmation of what has been said of the Pope's dictating these Canons to this Council; for they acknowledge, " They offer not their Advice in these Matters, which " would be a high Affront to the Apostolick See, " from whence they (the Inquisitors) had receiv'd " their Power; but zealously offer their Help, as " they were commanded by the same Apostolick " See;

" See; *ſicut & nobis ab ipſa Apoſtolica Sede mandatum* " *eſt, &c. Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 501.

All the Canons of this Council relate wholly to the Inquiſition; and are indeed but ſo many Lectures upon the ſeveral Parts of Cruelty they treat of. I ſhall inſtance but in a few. " The 22d " forbids the Names of the Witneſſes to be publiſh'd " by any Sign or Word, according to the Order " of the Pope; and that, if the Perſon accuſed " ſhall urge that he has Enemies, the Inquiſitors " ſhall demand their Names, and the Cauſe of " their Differences, that the Truth may be known. *Con. T* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 494. This is reckon'd a very unjudicial Proceeding in Lay-Caſes; but is much more unjuſtifiable in Religious, wherein Religious Judges ought to exert their Charity in the moſt tender Sentiments of Perſons and Things. There never yet was a Man ſo perfect as to live without Enemies, and it has too frequently appeared, that the moſt Virtuous were the moſt violently attack'd, and therefore the moſt ſtrict Regard ought to be had to the Preſervation of their Innocence, which many Times ſuffers, whilſt Guilt triumphs in Impunity. There is an innate Quality in Innocence, which has often charm'd the moſt malicious Accuſer, and baffled a falſe Evidence, tho' of the moſt harden'd Front; but when an innocent Perſon is thus attack'd in the Dark, it is ſcarcely poſſible for him to make his Defence; and what is practic'd in no Court of Judicature in the Chriſtian World but in this of the Inquiſition.

The 24th and 25th Canons add ſtill to the Darkneſs of theſe Proceedings; for they allow, *ibid.* " all Perſons, tho' Criminals, ſcandalous, and even " Partakers of the Crime it ſelf, to be admitted as " Accuſers and Witneſſes, provided that their Te-

ſtimony

" ſtimony or Accuſation does not proceed more " from Malice than any true Zeal to Juſtice: For, " ſay they, there are many Crimes which weaken " an Evidence, but not take it off, eſpecially if " the Witneſſes have ſatisfied the Law." Theſe two Canons are grounded upon a very falſe Baſis, for how frequently has the Malice of Men tranſported them beyond Truth and Juſtice, to teſtify againſt their Neighbours, not only in common Caſes, but thoſe of Life, and this in the Eye of the World has falſly been interpreted Zeal to Juſtice. But then, as to Perſons concern'd in the ſame Crime with the Accuſed, I cannot ſee how theſe Canons or any elſe can make it out that they ought to be admitted as legal Witneſſes: For Firſt, though they have made canonical Satisfaction for paſt Crimes, and are thereby become *Recti in Curia*, yet there ought to be a particular Regard had to the Weight of their Evidence. But Secondly, if they are involv'd in the Guilt of the ſame Crime with the Accuſed, they cannot be ſaid to have made canonical Satisfaction, and conſequently are not legal Witneſſes. Theſe Conſiderations would weigh mightily in other Courts of Judicature. But there are other Hardſhips: The 26th Canon ſays, " If any Man ſhall obſtinately deny the Crime by " which he is judg'd a Heretick, or Favourer of " ſuch, either by Witneſs, or other Proof, (*which* " *can be no other than Circumſtance*) he ſhall notwith- " ſtanding be eſteem'd a Heretick." This Canon is plainly founded upon the two former, but with this Improvement, *viz.* that of circumſtantial Proof, if there be no other Evidence; which makes the Caſe of the Accuſed ſtill more unreaſonable: For ſuppoſing a Set of hard-mouth'd Evidence, either through Malice, Fear, Hope of Gain, or ſaving their own Lives, ſwear Home againſt an innocent

Per-

Person; or, if such positive Evidence be wanting, bare circumstantial Proof be alledg'd against the Person accused, he shall be condemned as a Heretick, or Favourer of such. This is as severe as it is unreasonable, for tho' this Canon pretends to give a Reason for it, *viz.* "That he is manifestly im-" penitent that will not confess his Fault:" Yet that Person who, being innocent of the Crime he is accused of, that shall be so unjust as through Fear or otherwise to accuse himself, cannot be said to be innocent to himself, tho' he is of the Crime; and he is indeed guilty of his own Blood, but not of what he stands accused; which is no Justification of this Canon, or its Reason. Such are the unreasonable Methods of this Court of Inquisition; which, tho' they were design'd against others, have often ensnar'd the very Inquisitors themselves, who then, though too late, condemn'd such unjust Proceedings.

Gregory IX. now draws near the End of his Pontificate and Life, but not of his Malice. In the Year 1239, he again excommunicates the Emperor *Frederick*; and by his Legate *Jacob*, Cardinal Bishop of *Preneste*, sends a Letter to *Lewis* King of *France*; wherein, after a long Encomium on him and his Predecessors, he sues for Aid against the Emperor, towards whom he is not sparing of Invectives. But the Emperor making light of all this, the Cardinal Legate calls a Council at *Melde*, now *Meaulx*, in *France*; where, having before publish'd the Sentence of Excommunication against the Emperor, he commands some of them upon their Obedience to go with him personally to *Rome*: And the more effectually to ruine the Emperor's Interest, the Pope advises and persuades his Son *Henry* to take Arms against him. But these wicked Methods had their deserved Success; for the good

Pope

Pope being defeated by the Emperor, is forc'd to accept of what hard Conditions of Peace the Conqueror would grant; which he was as dexterous at violating as any of his Predeceſſors. For the Emperor is no ſooner retir'd, but he renounces the Articles of Peace, excommunicates the Emperor once more, and abſolves his Subjects from their Allegiance to him. This was a Home Stroke indeed, and, no Doubt, heartily meant; but it wanted its deſired End: For Succeſs ſtill attending the Emperor, his Holineſs is defeated at his own Weapon. The Emperor, not to be behind-hand in ſo pious a Precedent, remonſtrates to the *Germans* the unmeaſurable Pride of the *Roman* Pontiff, which nothing leſs than Univerſality both in Church and State can gratify; which ſo prevail'd with the Biſhops of *Germany*, that they immediately threw off the *Roman* Yoak, and declaring, that the Biſhop of *Rome* had no Right in *Germany*, they abſolv'd the Emperor from his Excommunication; which ſo deeply affected good Pope *Gregory*, that he died of Grief; tho' the Editors, in their Account of him, ſay, that he died of Grief for the captive Biſhops that were taken Priſoners by the Emperor as they were going to *Rome*. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 310.

[1241.] *Celeſtine* IV. ſucceeds Pope *Gregory* IX. a Man, according to *Mat. Paris*, of good Life and Learning: But being very old and infirm, he in few Days reſign'd the Pontificate with his Breath. Conſidering the entangled and confus'd State of Affairs both of the Empire and the Church at this Time, it is almoſt impoſſible but that this Pope muſt be ſchiſmatically elected. This the Editors very unluckily, as uſually, ſtart; but more lamely excuſe. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 590. *Matt. Paris*, they ſay, writes, That Pope *Celeſtine* was choſen in Schiſm; for, according to the Firſt Canon of the Third

Third General *Lateran* Council, there ought to be Two Thirds of the Cardinals at the Election of a Pope; which at this Time could not be had, most of them being detained by the Emperor. But this they would seem to take off by the weak Help of *Abbas Stadensis*, who, they say, tells us, That the two opponent Schismatical Competitors resigning, *Celestine* was legally chosen in the Room of Pope *Gregory*. This is so far from excusing, that it confirms this to be a Schismatical Election, by putting in One Schismatical Bishop upon the Resignation of Two. Besides the Editors themselves give for a Reason, in the Vacancy of the See of *Rome* upon *Celestine*'s Death, " That it was neither safe nor " convenient, in the Absence of the captive Car- " dinals, to proceed to the Election of a Pontiff." Which may in Parity of Reason hold in the Case of *Celestine*, after Pope *Gregory* IX.'s Decease, (for then the Cardinals were imprison'd) as well as in the Case of *Innocent* IV. after *Celestine*'s; when the Holy See was vacant for Twenty Months. This is all the Editors can make of it; and their Friend *Cabbasutius* passes it over in Silence; only in his Chronological Index inserts *Celestine*, without any Mark of Schism, or Vacancy of the See, till *Innocent* IV.'s Election; which, notwithstanding the positive Account the Editors give of it in the Life of this Pope, is as questionable as Pope *Celestine*'s.

[1243.] *Innocent* IV. before called *Sinibaldus*, is by them said to be chosen Pope the 24th of *June*, by the common Consent of the Cardinals, whose Enlargement was obtained at the Request of *Baldwin* Emperor of *Constantinople*, and *Lewis* King of *France*. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 597. This might pass for Truth with some that read no further, but the very same Authors, *ibid. p.* 634, 635. destroy the very Plausibility of it, by a flat Contradiction in their Histo-

History of the First General Council of *Lyons*, which was the First Council called by *Innocent* IV. " *Cardinales vix post viginti Menses Innocentium quar-* " *tum, Virum Doctrinâ & Virtute præstantem Pontifi-* " *cem maximum delegerunt. Hic Pontifex statim cum* " *Friderico de Pace egit, Hominesque gravissimos ad illum* " *misit, qui æquissimas ei Pacis Conditiones proponerent* " *& postularent, ut Patres qui in Pugna navali capti* " *fuerant, ut sæpe promiserat, Liberos redderet. His* " *Pontificis Cohortationibus cùm Fridericus obtemperare* " *nollet, &c.* The Cardinals, after near Twenty " Months Vacancy, chose *Innocent* IV. Pope; a " Man eminent for Learning and good Life: Who " immediately treats with the Emperor about " Peace, and setting at Liberty those Fathers " which were taken in the Sea-Fight, as he had " often promis'd. But *Frideric* would by no Means " hearken to any of these Proposals, *&c.*" But to explain this Relation a little more, and take off the most minute Objection; if any one should think that the Word *Patres* does not mean the Cardinals and Bishops, look but a few Lines back, *ibid.* and they are called by those very Names, *Episcopi & Cardinales capti sunt, &c.* " The *Genoese* Ships fal- " ling in with *Frideric*'s Fleet, the Bishops and " Cardinals were taken and carried to the Empe- " ror." From hence it must naturally be infer'd, That the Cardinals being detained by the Emperor, could not be at the Election of Pope *Innocent* any more than at *Celestine*'s; and consequently that Story of the Editors, which tells us that *Innocent* IV. was elected by the common Consent of the Cardinals, who were set at Liberty by *Frideric* at the Instance of the Emperor *Baldwin* and King *Lewis*, is a direct Falsity. Such Romantick Authors have need of better Memories! But they go on, and truly when their Hand's in, they know not

when or where to leave off. *Ibid. p.* 597. " This " Election, say they, was not in the left pleasing " to *Frideric*, who knew *Innocent* to be a just and " generous Man; and therefore he was afraid that " he should find him, who whilst a Cardinal was " his Friend, to be his Enemy when Pope." This is very odd; for on the contrary *Frideric* had the greater Reason to expect a Friend in the Pope than an Enemy, they both, according to the Editors, having been good Friends before. And as to *Frideric*'s Dislike of the Election, the Inference shews much Malice in the Author, without just Ground; for he must be the most abandon'd Wretch imaginable, that can be angry at any one for his Vertue: And as to the Election of this Pope being ungrateful to the Emperor, it had been better for the Editors to have been silent; for any Person will be apt to conclude, that that Prince who had the Electors in his Power, had he been such a Monster as the Friends of the Pontificate make him, would have pointed out a Pope for them to choose, or continued them in Prison. These Things put together make the Election of this Pope still darker; and such contradictory Stories make the Editors, in the Opinion of the ingenious and impartial, but very Triflers.

Pope *Innocent* IV. having obtained the Pontifical Chair, presently projects the Chastisement of the Emperor *Frideric*, (a very slender Token of antecedent Friendship between them!) which that he might perform with the greater Plausibility and Form, he proposes to do it in a General Council. But this the Emperor's Power in *Italy* prevents. The Pope therefore embarks in a *Genoese* Ship, *A. D.* 1244. and safely arrives in *France*, where the Year following at *Lyons* he calls a General Council, to which he summons the Emperor, who sent Ad-

Advocates to defend his Cause; among whom, one *Thadæus*, an eloquent and learned Man, so well behav'd himself in the Emperor's Cause, that he refuted the Reasons and Arguments objected against his Master. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 635. But he might as well have said nothing. The Pope prosecutes furiously, and the Council determine in Prejudice of the Emperor, who is excommunicated in this Form—— "We declare and pronounce the fore-"said Prince, who hath render'd himself unworthy "of Imperial and Regal Dignity, and who by his "Iniquities is rejected by God from governing, "excommunicate, and sententially deprive him "of all Honour and Dignity; absolving all those "who were under any Obligation of paying Al-"legiance to him from their Oath: And, by Ver-"tue of our Apostolick Authority, we strictly "forbid every one for the future to obey or regard "him as Emperor or King, and pronounce all "those *ipso facto* excommunicate, who shall advise, "assist or favour him as such. And that those "whose Office it is to choose an Emperor, have "Liberty to proceed to the Election of a Succes-"sor." *Ibid. p.* 645. This is a memorable Continuation of the *Roman* Pontiff's usurping the Power of deposing Princes, nor is it the last by many. In this Council Pope *Innocent* was sure to carry his Point in every Thing he proposed, relating either to the *Greek* or *Latin* Church. For besides the great Number of Cardinals, Bishops, Abbots, and inferior Clergy, there were present the Emperor of *Constantinople*, and the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* and *Antioch*; who are now become Fiefs of the Pontificate of *Rome*; and the Patriarchs no more than her Legate in their own Sees. To secure this Conquest therefore, which his Predecessors had obtained, and which he as successfully maintains,

this Pope, to make the *Greek* Empire and Church hold more dependently of the Church of *Rome*, the more earneſtly puſhes on the Recovery of the Eaſtern Empire from the *Saracens*, who had by this Time over-run the greateſt Part of it. In order to which, the laſt Four Canons of this Council were made. The Fourteenth taxes all Eccleſiaſtical Benefices. The Fifteenth obliges all Prelates earneſtly to preſs their People to bequeath in their Wills ſomething toward the Recovery of the Holy-Land, and the Empire of *Romania*, *pro ſuorum Peccaminum Remiſſione*. In this Council Pope *Innocent* IV. created ſeveral Cardinals, and was the firſt that diſtinguiſh'd them by giving the *Red Hat*, in Token, that they ſhould always be ready to ſpend their Blood in Defence of the Chriſtian Religion againſt all Oppoſers, eſpecially *Frideric* II. late Emperor, (as they call him) who had been the great Perſecutor of the *Roman* Church. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 598. The Emperor ſtill labours under the heavy Reſentment of the Biſhop of *Rome*, which is ſeverely repeated, *A. D.* 1248. in the Council of *Valentia* in *France*; where, in the Preſence of Two Cardinals, and the Biſhops of Four Provinces, there is an Addition to the Second Canon in Prejudice of the Emperor, *viz.* That to the Oath which all are bound to take for Preſervation of the Peace, this be added, " That they ſhall give no Aid, and " ſhew no Favour to that Schiſmatick *Frideric*, Di- " ſturber of the Peace, and Author of Sedition." The Twenty ſecond Canon of this Council goes further, and excommunicates all Clergymen and Prelates who ſhall aſſiſt or favour the Emperor; and if any of them ſhall dare to call him in, they are to be deprived of their Benefices and Dignities; from which Sentence they can be abſolv'd by none, but the Pope himſelf or his ſpecial Mandate.

The

The Year after the Emperor dies, and his Sons *Conrad* and *Manfred*, claiming their hereditary Right, his Holineſs oppoſes them with an Army of *Croiſades*; but not ſucceeding this Way againſt them, he opens his Magazine of *Anathema's*, and excommunicates them both: Notwithſtanding which, *Conrad* ſucceeds his Father *Frideric*, though *Innocent* IV. and *Alexander* IV. oppos'd him; the latter of which intended to have crown'd *William* Earl of *Holland* Anti-Cæſar, but he was ſlain in his Way to *Rome* by the *Friſons*.

[1254.] *Roland* Nephew to Pope *Gregory* IX. and ſomewhat related to *Innocent* III. ſucceeds *Innocent* IV. under the Name of *Alexander* IV. He was as active as any of his Predeceſſors in the Proſecution either of the Hereticks, or the old Quarrel between the Emperor *Frideric* and the Popes during that Time; and that he may ſeem to outdo his Predeceſſors, he falls heavily on the Hereticks by his Legate *Peter de Lamballe* in the Council of *Albia*, where, in the Sixth Canon, the more to terrify People from entertaining or favouring Hereticks, it is decreed, That the Houſe wherein a Heretick ſhall be found ſhall be deſtroyed, and the Ground whereon it ſtood confiſcated. In the Twenty fifth Canon, That if it ſhall appear, that any one died in Hereſy, his dead Body ſhall be digged up and burnt. And in the Twenty ſixth, That the Temporal Power ſhall, under Pain of Eccleſiaſtick Cenſure, be compell'd to confiſcate their Eſtates, and exhumate their Bodies. And to ſhew how abſolute by Degrees this Office of Inquiſition grew, the Twenty eighth Canon plainly demonſtrates; for any Perſon, though but ſuſpected of Hereſy, that being legally ſummoned, as they call it, ſhould abſent or refuſe to appear before the Dioceſan or Inquiſitors, ſhould be condemned as a

Heretick, though nothing was prov'd against him. This is arbitrary to the very utmost; for, considering the Latitude of the Inquisitors Commission, few Persons, against whom they had any Pique, could escape their Vulture Claws, where Suspicion alone shall be counted a Crime, and for their bare absenting incur the Sentence. There is one Thing at the End of this Council worth noting. *Cossart*, observing from *Dacherius* the exact Time of this Council, says, it was called at *Albia* by the Command of *Lewis* King of the *Franks*. Hence it is plain, that though the Popes by their Legates held Councils in *France*, and presided in them by their Legates, yet they were call'd by the express Command of the King. *Con. Tom.* XI. *par.* 1. *p.* 738.

In the Pontificate of this Pope was that memorable Quarrel between the Sorbonists, and the Friars Mendicants, and Preachers; in which, Pope *Alexander* IV. most ignominiously distinguish'd himself in Favour of those Wretches, whom the Sorbonists, arm'd with Justice and Truth, most strenuously oppos'd. The Dispute lay between the University of *Paris* in general and the foresaid Friars, though the College of *Sorbon* were most conspicuous in it, and particularly *William de St. Amore*, a learned Doctor thereof. These Preachers and Mendicants, through the Bigotry and Indulgence of several Princes and People, for some Time rambled uncontroul'd, taking upon them to confess and preach wherever they came, without the Consent of the Bishop, utterly despising all Canons and Ecclesiastical Rules; and professing voluntary Poverty, and Contempt of Riches, wandering like Strollers from Place to Place, under a Pretence of Piety, they chous'd the silly People of their Money. At last they would pretend to teach the Youth in the University, but would not be subject

to

to the Government of the University. This was Part of the Quarrel. In the Year 1254, or the Year following, the pious Brethren publish'd a Book, which they pretend was written by *John of Parma*, General of the *Minorites*, call'd, *The Eternal Gospel, or the Gospel of the Holy Ghost*; in which, according to *William de St. Amore*, in his Book, *De Periculis novissimorum Temporum, &c. c. 8. p. 8.* which he wrote in Answer to them, they affirmed, *That the Eternal Gospel, or Gospel of the Holy Ghost, was more perfect, and better, than the Gospel of Christ; and that upon its Appearance the Gospel of Christ should be void.* But because his Holiness the Pope was immediately applied to and concerned in this Case, I will be somewhat the more particular in the dangerous and blasphemous Tenets of this Book from the Authority of *Matt. Paris, ad Ann.* 1257. *p.* 939. *Nic. Eymeric. Director, Inquisit. par. 2. quæst. 9. sect. 4. Bulæi Histor. Univers. Paris. T.* III. *p.* 330. *& Usher. de Christ. Eccl. Success. c. 9. sect.* 19, 20, 21. *&c.* Besides the foresaid blasphemous Opinions, this Book held, *That the Eternal Gospel excelled the Old and New Testament, which would hold in Force no longer than the Year* 1260, *after which, all would be in a State of Perfection: That none were fit to instruct People in Spiritual Matters and Eternal Salvation but they that went barefoot*; (a necessary Qualification indeed for a Preacher, or a Confessor!) *That Christ and the Holy Apostles were not perfect in a contemplative Life, and that the contemplative Life began first to fructify under* Joachim *the Abbot, and improve under his Successors.* The Parisian Academicks abhorring these execrable Blasphemies, unanimously agree to extirpate these damnable Doctrines; in order to which they condemn the Book, and expel the Friars, and send Delegates to the Pope to justify their Proceedings. The Matter being so very flagitious, his Holiness

 consents

consents to the condemning the Book, but would have it done so privately, that it might not scandalize the Friars; so tenderly did the *good Man* treat his Creatures, though the worst of humane Race, and raging even to Madness against the Christian Religion. The *Parisians* continuing resolute in their Decrees against the Friars, the good Pope, *A. D.* 1256, sends a Letter to them, wherein he severely reprehends them, and especially *William de S. Amore*, their chief Champion: But the Academicks continuing their former Resolution in Defence of the Christian Religion against this Antichristian Monarch, to shew whom he serv'd, he degrades *William*, and Three other Doctors, and deprives them of all Ecclesiastical Dignities; and taking the Advantage of good King *Lewis*'s Easiness and Bigotry, he procures their Banishment. This Treatment does not in the least abate the Courage of the Sufferers. *William de S. Amore* writes a sarcatical Invective against the Friars, wherein he exposes their Knaveries to the World, and very severely reproaches the Pope for his unreasonable Pride. This Book, which was, *De Periculis novissimorum Temporum, adversus Mendicantes*, (as has been mentioned) was, with the Author, condemned of Heresy, and by the express Order of Pope *Alexander* IV. burnt at *Rome* and *Paris*. *William* not discouraged at this, pursues his Resentment against the Friars, exhorting all People to forbear their Benevolence to them, for it was no way meritorious to relieve a Pack of lusty lazy Monks, and who, to the great Prejudice and Scandal of Parochial Priests, had unlawfully usurp'd the Office of Preaching and Confessing. Pope *Alexander* being still more incens'd against him, makes a home Blow at him; and prevail'd so far, as to have him banished all Parts of the King of

France's

France's Dominions, and forbids him to write or teach, under Pain of Excommunication. The good Man dies soon after this, and is by the Friars, Preachers, and Mendicants, registred among the Hereticks; but *Laurentius Anglicus*, the Abbot, bravely defended his Memory against these prattling Wretches, and succeeds *William de St. Amore* in his Resentment, being a terrible Scourge and irreconcileable Enemy to the lazy Friars. The Editors in the Life of this Pope give a very gentle Touch of this Matter, by saying, *That he was so great a Favourer of the Poor, that he would not allow any Books to be written against them.* Con. Tom. XI. par. 1. p. 716. This in it self is the most insipid and unnecessary Piece of Flattery that could be daub'd upon his Memory; and is so far from being an Addition to his Character, that it directly implies a Diminution of it: For as he must be a very ill Man that should write against the Poor; so consequently he that can prevent any such Writing, and does not, is equally as bad. But this is not the Case: The Poor they here mean cannot be imagined to be the wretched, distressed, hungry, naked, starving Poor, against whom no Man, I dare affirm, to this Day ever wrote a Treatise; but they were the lazy, vagabond, strolling, poor, mendicant Friars; and the Books wrote against them, which he would not allow, were what honest orthodox *William de S. Amore* publish'd. This is still disingenuous Dealing in the Editors, and I fear we shall not find them more sincere the further we go.

In the Year 1260, the Editors pretend a Council at *Arles*, under *Florentine* the Archbishop thereof, and his Suffragans. There is no Account or History of this Council either in the Title or Preface to it, as is usual in others; only *Cossart* at the End

of it very lamely and impertinently fixes the Time of it from Part of the Preface, which is nothing to the Purpose. *Con. T.* XI. *par.* 2. *p.* 2361. The Words from whence he concludes the Date of this Council are these, *Secundam attribuunt Filio, & duravit Annis* MCCLX. This relates no Way to the Time of the Council, but only to the Time which the Old and New Testament should last, which, according to the *Evangelium Æternum*, lately mentioned, was no longer than the Year MCCLX. so that *Cossart* had better have relied wholly on the Authority of the *Codex Chisianus*, than have introduced a Citation nothing to Purpose. But the true Reason for introducing this Council, I am very apt to think, was to reinforce an old Forgery, which was foisted into the Fourth Council of *Carthage*, *A. D.* 399. The Hundredth Canon of which, according to *Gratian* and *Peter Lombard*, Two Brethren in Iniquity, allows Lay-Baptism in Case of Necessity; which we have sufficiently already confuted. *Vid. supra.* Now I cannot see for what End this Council is brought in here, except for the Sake of the Second Canon of it; which plainly allows the same; for it says, *That on Holidays the Parish-Priest shall instruct their Parishioners how, and in what Form of Words they shall baptize their Children in Case of Necessity.* Here is Mission and Function dispens'd at once by a private Priest, who himself must receive them both from a Bishop, who alone has Power to give them. I wish such Irregularities and Innovations have not given an Opportunity to the many Sectaries later Ages have produced, to assume those Characters which do not belong to them.

This Year likewise the Editors introduce a peremptory Edict of this Pope's, call'd *Constitutio Cypria*; not said to be decreed in any Council, but the

the simple Act of the supream Pontiff, and that it may stand as a lasting Precedent, bears this Title, *Alexander Episcopus, Servus Servorum Dei, ad futuram Rei Memoriam.* The State of the *Greek* Church was now become most deplorable; and, to keep it in an entire Subjection to that of *Rome*, the Sovereign Bishop publishes this Constitution by Vertue of his single Authority, though subscribed to by several Cardinals; for the whole Constitution carries an Air of Monarchy throughout; and no *Greek* Bishop in the Isle of *Cyprus* was to be allowed as such, unless confirmed by a Bishop of the *Latin* Church, who was to receive his Profession of Canonical Obedience to the Church of *Rome*. It is, in short, as enslaving an Edict as ever passed from the Mouth of the most Arbitrary Tyrant; and his cajoling the poor *Greek* Bishops, in calling them Brethren, is as ridiculous a Banter as his calling himself their Brother, whilst he Lords it over them in the most domineering Manner.

As to the Temporal Affairs of this Pope, he is no less vigorous in the Prosecution of them than any of his Predecessors. In the Third Year of his Pontificate he excommunicated the Electors that adhered to the Interest of *Conrardine*, Nephew to the Emperor *Frederick* II. And the same Year being very much distressed by *Manfred*, he commands *Henry* III. King of *England*, to assist him in the Recovery of *Sicily*, under Pain of Excommunication. And because the *Florentines* and *Genoese* would not violate the League they had made with *Manfred*, he anathematizes both. At last, in vain attempting to reconcile the *Venetians* and *Genoese*, whose Differences had much retarded the Prosecution of his own Affairs, he paid the last Debt to Nature, and is succeeded by

[1261.] *Urban* IV. before call'd *James Pantaleon*,

a

a *French*-man by Nation; who, though of mean Parentage, by hard Study and assiduous Application to Business, soon became eminent in the Court of *Rome*, being, after several Promotions in the Church, by his Predecessor Pope *Alexander* IV. deputed his Legate in *Pomerania*, *Prussia*, *Livonia*, and all *Germany*. The Year after his Advancement to the Pontificate, he prosecutes the old Quarrel between the late Pope and *Manfred* King of *Sicily*, whom he excommunicates, promising a plenary Indulgence and Remission of Sins to all who should arm against him; succeeding his Predecessors in their Temporal Usurpations; though otherwise a Man of polite Genius; which, according to *Stella*, was very becoming: For being reproached upon the Obscurity of his Birth, (his Father being but a Cobbler by Trade) he very wittily and justly replied, *A Man was not born noble, but became so by his virtuous Acquisitions.*

[1265.] *Clement* IV. before call'd *Guido Fulcodius*, being Legate to *Urban* IV. in *England*, was, upon the Vacancy of the See, chosen Pope. A Man of a very fair Character, bating his Resentment to the Family of the Emperor *Friderick*, and the Usurpation of the *Roman* Patriarchate on the Ecclesiastick and Civil Power. He was a *French*-man by Nation, bred up to the Civil Law, in which he became an eminent Advocate, and was afterwards a Counsellor to the King of *France*, in which Promotion he married, and had Two Daughters; but upon the Death of his Wife, he renounc'd the World; and for his singular Morality and Piety was made Bishop of *Le Puy*, afterwards Archbishop of *Narbon*, and then Cardinal-Bishop of *Sabina*. Upon his Promotion to the Prime See, he shew'd great Humility; and was so far from encouraging any Thing like Nepotism, (a Practice

of

of later Times) that he disposed of his Two Daughters without Robbing the Church to raise their Fortunes; giving to each but Thirty Pounds: And marrying one to a Plebeian, he plac'd the other in a Monastry.

In the Year 1267, a Council was call'd at *Vienna* by Cardinal *Guido* the Pope's Legate: In which there were Nineteen Canons made, and several of them very good: But the Ninth reserves a dispensing Power to the Apostolick See in a most irregular Enormity; for, declaring expresly against conferring Benefices, with Cures of Souls, on Minors of Eighteen Years of Age, the same Canon reserves a Power of dispensing with it in the Apostolick See or her Legates, contrary to the Practice of the Primitive Fathers. From whence, as has been before observed, so many even in Swaddling-Clothes have in later Times been promoted to the highest Dignities in the Church. There is likewise another Reserve of Power to the Holy See in the Thirteenth Canon; where, upon the repeated Complaints of the Irregularities of the Black Monks of St. *Benedict*'s Order, after a strict Charge to the Bishops of the Province of *Saltzburg*, and the Bishop of *Prague*, or any of them, to visit and reform all Abuses in the foresaid Monks, those are excepted who are under the immediate Cognizance of the Bishop of *Rome*, who are to be visited only by his Holiness, or his Legates: Which is no better than encouraging Rebellion in each particular District, and very opposite to the Discipline of more regular and ancient Ages, which subjected all Regulars to the Visitation of their proper Diocesan.

Cossart, in his Note at the End of the Council of *London*, which was held there *A. D.* 1268. after something said to little Purpose, is guilty of a most

most ridiculous Piece of Malice, by questioning the Veracity of our faithful Collector Sir *H. Spelman*, upon an Error which cannot be suppos'd his. He calls it *gravis Lapsus in Anglicana Collectione*; and, after all the mighty Expectation this insignificant Reproach can excite, it is, because it is in *Spelman*, *cap.* 11. *p.* 263. plac'd to the Year MCCXLVIII. whereas it shou'd have been to the Year MCCLXVIII. This must certainly be the Printer's Fault, and not the Collector's. And whoever hath had Occasion to peruse the Second Tome of Sir *H. Spelman*'s, will own it to be the most uncorrect Book ever printed at *London* before. But *Cossart* had no Reason to take hold on such a poor Occasion to quarrel with that great Man, (whose Integrity as an Editor far outshines him and his Partner *Labbé*) for the Reader might easily set himself right in Point of Chronology, by the Date of the Council, from Cardinal *Ottoboni*, the Pope's Legate, who presided in it, and the Reign of the Pope whom he represented, which was *Clement* IV. as is express'd in *Spelman*; for the Year of our Lord MCCXLVIII. was the Sixth Year of Pope *Innocent* IV. If it were worth while, I could easily recriminate upon *Cossart* from many such Mistakes; (not to call them in him, as he does in our *Spelman*, *Graviores Lapsus*:) But the transposing of a Letter or Figure, though it may often invert the Sense or Time, being so easily remediable, especially in the present Case, I shall waste no further Time about it.

[1271.] After a Vacancy of Three Years and Two Months, *Theobald*, by the Name of *Gregory* X. is promoted to the See of *Rome*, being at that Time with *Edward* Prince of *Wales* in *Palestine*. His Pontificate was not illustrated with many remarkable Passages, the Second general Council of *Lyons* making the greatest Figure in it. This Council

was call'd chiefly upon the Neceſſity of the Affairs in the Eaſt and in *Greece*; for *Baldwin* the laſt Latin Emperor being driven out of *Conſtantinople*, *Michael Paleologus* is choſen Emperor of *Greece*. The Pope obſerving the drooping State of the *Greek* Empire, takes Advantage of their Neceſſity: For the Emperor *Michael*, afraid of drawing the Weſtern Princes into *Greece* again, ſends Ambaſſadors and Legates from himſelf and the Church, with full Inſtructions to conſent and ſubmit to what ſhould be offered. The Synod began *May* 7. *A. D.* 1274. In which Pope *Gregory* X. preſided. The Three principal Reaſons for celebrating it were theſe: 1. For ſending Succour into the Eaſt. 2. For procuring a Reconciliation between the Weſtern and Eaſtern Churches. 3. For a more ſpeedy and regular Election of a Pope. The indiſpenſable Neceſſity the Emperor *Michael* labour'd under, of ſolliciting Aid from the Weſtern Princes againſt the Infidels, obliged him to many hard Conditions, which otherwiſe the *Greeks* uſed to reject with the laſt Contempt. He not only in his Letters to the Pope pays all Homage and Acknowledgment which the moſt depreſs'd, ſlaviſh, captivated Wretch could do to the Supreme Pontiff, but by his Nuncio takes a formal Oath of Obedience, ſwearing to preſerve inviolably rhe Catholick Faith, as the Church of *Rome* profeſſes and preaches it. He likewiſe recognizes the Supremacy of that Church, and ſwears Canonical Obedience to it. In the ſame Form the Prelates of *Greece* both write an Epiſtle, and by their Legates take the Oath. Theſe were Acts of Neceſſity indeed, on which the Biſhop of *Rome* laid ſo great Streſs, that no Reconciliation was to be expected, (and conſequently no Aid againſt the Infidels) but upon theſe Terms: 1. That the *Roman* Pontiff's Name ſhould

be

be mentioned in their Celebration of the Mass. 2. That all Appeals from the *Greeks* should be made to the Apostolick See. 3. That the *Roman* Pontiff's Supremacy should be acknowledged by all. These Terms the Eastern Church always highly stomach'd: For, as to the First, it is plain, that in the Time of St. *Chrysostome*, at *Constantinople*, they recognized their own Patriarch only. As to the Second Article, *viz.* that of Appeals, it was about what the *Greeks* for many Centuries contested with the *Romans*; and particularly the *Africans*, who always, whilst that Church maintained its Glory, own'd and acknowledg'd no Supremacy in the Church of *Rome* that could claim the Right of Appeals, but in her own District. The Third Article likewise from very primitive Times had been contested with them of *Rome*, not only by the *Greek*, but likewise by several Western Patriarchs and Metropolitans, as has been already noted, who would not allow of that arbitrary Supremacy which the Bishops of *Rome* have claimed in later Times, and which they for many Ages in vain attacked the neighbouring Powers for: But at last their large Acquisitions and Encroachments in Temporals enabled them to compass that by Force which they could not obtain by Pretence of Claim. But this extorted Obedience from the State and Church of *Greece* was of but short Continuance, as we shall shew in its proper Place.

Before I part with this Second General Council of *Lyons*, I must beg Leave to recover an Inadvertency which I have committed in the Papacy of Pope *Silvester* I. *A. D.* 324. *Cabbasutius*'s being positive in the Matter, made me the more suspect the Truth of it; the Discovery of which will not be unpleasant to the Reader. At the End of this Council, *Cabbasutius*, *p.* 489. has a Dissertation concerning

cerning the Election of a Pope and Cardinals; which pretending to fortify by unjust Authorities and impertinent Proofs, will be worth while to make a strict Inspection into; by doing which, I shall likewise recover a Forgery in the Fourth Century, which I inadvertently omitted.

Considering the frequent Interruptions in the Succession of Popes, the many illegal and schismatical Elections, and the simoniacal and other unwarrantable Means us'd to obtain the Papacy, *Cabbasutius* had much better have been silent; for till they had fix'd the Power of electing the Bishop of *Rome* in the College of Cardinals, he does but aggravate the Irregularities of Elections, instead of justifying them from the Authority of St. *Cyprian*. The good Opinion this Father had of Pope *Cornelius*, and of the Legality of his Election, appears from the several Epistles he wrote to, and concerning him. He allows him to be made a Bishop, *de Dei & Christi ejus Judicio, de Clericorum pene omnium Testimonio, de Plebis, quæ tum adfuit, Suffragio, & de antiquorum Sacerdotum & bonorum Virorum Collegio.* Ep. 52. *By the Decree of God and his Christ, by the Testimony of almost all the Clergy, by the Consent of the People present, and by the Congregation of the ancient Priests and good Men.* To this he subjoins the Fourth and Sixth Canons of the First *Nicene* Council, and the Ninety second Epistle of Pope *Leo* to *Rusticus*: All which agree in the ancient Manner of Electing a Bishop, which is very different from that of the College of Cardinals. He goes on with the Interruption of this Method of Electing, by the Interposing Authority of the Emperors, as in the Case of *Damasus* and *Ursicinus*, decided by the Emperor *Valentinian*; that of *Boniface* and *Eulalius*, by *Honorius*; and that of *Symmachus* and *Laurence*, by *Theo-*

doric the *Gothick* Emperor. Afterwards *Justinian*, having recovered *Italy* from the *Goths*, would not admit a Pope to be chosen without his Approbation; which Custom continued till *Constantine's* Time. He is mistaken in what he says of *Charlemain's* restoring the *Roman* Church to her Liberty, if he means that of electing a Bishop; for not only he, but his Son *Lewis* the Holy, his Grandson *Lotharius*, and several others, his Successors, nam'd 'em to the Time of *Otho* I. who deposed *John* XII. and put *Leo* VIII. in his Room. What *Cabbasutius* hath hitherto said, has rather destroyed than strengthened the Power of electing the Pope by the Conclave of Cardinals, for hitherto he does not find them mentioned. But to give a Face of Antiquity to this Innovation, he tells us, *p.* 490. § 6. it is not certain when the Choice of the Supream Bishop devolved upon the Cardinals; tho' it is very probable it might be upon the Inauguration of *Leo* IX. in whose Promotion *Hildebrand*, afterwards Pope by the Name of *Gregory* VII. was very instrumental. And yet he allows it as uncertain, whether before or after *Otho* I. the Power of Electing the Pope was in the Breast of the Conclave, or not. The Authority of *Peter Damiani* and others are invalid, as being of later Times; and his Allusion of the Necessity of their assisting the Supream Bishop in Council from St. *Chrysostome*, is altogether impertinent. For although that Father, *Hom. ad c.* 1. *Act. Apost.* says, That St. *Peter* did nothing of Moment by Vertue of his own Authority, but by Consent of the Brethren: as in the Election of the Successor of *Judas* to the Apostleship; in the Election of the Seven Deacons; and in the Dispute about the Observation of Things lawful: Yet he, *viz. Cabbasutius*, makes a false Inference, that from thence it is plain that the Conclave derive their Power, *&c.*

For

For in the Case of *Judas*'s Successor to the Apostleship, it is evident from the Text, that the Matter was synodically performed, and was the first Council held in the Church after our Blessed Lord's Ascension. As to the Case of the Election of the Seven Deacons, it was purely relating to Ordination; and the Dispute about the Observation of Things lawful was another synodical Act; which is by the Editors themselves allowed to be the Third Synod of the Apostles. So that these Allusions do no way affect the Necessity or Antiquity of the Conclave; which is more apparently demonstrated to be an Innovation from the Authority of a forged Council, than from any Thing else. In this same Dissertation of *Cabbasutius*, § 9. he pretends to derive the Name of Cardinal from very ancient Time, *viz.* from the Papacy of *Sylvester* I. *A. D.* 324. In which Year the Editors pretend a Council held at *Rome* under Pope *Sylvester*; in which there were Twenty Canons made, the Sixth of which mentions the Seven Cardinal-Deacons of *Rome*. This *Cabbasutius* endeavours to enforce in *p.* 124. But his Authority is notoriously false; for this Council and Canons are a plain Forgery: To which, after a faint Acknowledgment of *Crab*, *Surius*, *Nicolinus*, and *Binius*, *Labbé* in the Margin concedes in these Words: "These Canons are esteemed counterfeit "by *Hincmar*, and other learned Men, which *Isidore* "hath put into his Collection." But before we proceed further to enervate the Authority of this Council, it will be necessary to shew for what Ends it was forg'd. The First Canon was invented to prove that ridiculous Fable of *Constantine*'s being baptized by *Silvester*, (though it is well known he was born of Christian Parents) and of his being miraculously cleans'd of a Leprosy he never had. The Author of this Canon unwarily tells us, That

no Lay-Persons were there; and yet in the very next Paragraph he says, *Calfurnius* Governor of *Rome* was present at this Council; and, Can. 10. That he subscribed to it. Cardinal *Bellarmine*, *l.* 1. *de Cler. c.* 13. cites the Third Canon, to prove the Order of Exorcists to be an Ecclesiastick Order, and that anciently there were Seven Ecclesiastick Orders. He likewise, *ib. c.* 11. cites the Fifth Canon, to prove the Chrism to be the Material of the Sacrament of Confirmation, and that it ought to be consecrated. The Sixth Canon is also cited by him, *ib. c.* 16. to prove the Antiquity of Cardinals: The Eighth, to prove Celibacy necessary to Holy Orders: And the last, *l.* 2. *de Con. c.* 17. to prove, That the Bishop of *Rome* is above any Council; and also, *l.* 2. *de Rom. Pont. c.* 26. to prove, That he ought to be judged of none. These were the great Ends of inventing this Council. As to the Authority of this Council, *Bellarmine* can produce none more early than that of *Nicolaus Mysticus*, who liv'd above 500 Years after this Council is said to be held. Besides, the Title of it renders it still more suspicious; for it says, That the Council of *Nice* was call'd by this Pope, which is positively false, the *Roman* Editors themselves not agreeing in what Pope's Time it was held; and it is apparently known that the Emperor *Constantine* call'd it. The Fable of this Emperor's being baptiz'd by *Silvester*, and cleans'd of a Leprosy by him, mention'd in the First Canon, is sufficient to destroy the Credit of it; for *Eusebius*, who was Cotemporary with *Constantine*, and highly esteemed by him, would not have omitted such remarkable Passages, had they been true; nor do any of the later *Roman* Authors who write of the Pontificate, particularly *Canus*, *Platina*, *Alciatus*, and *Vives*, make any Mention of it, except the last, who calls

it a direct Fable. *L. 5. de Cauſ. Corrupt. Artium.* Upon ſuch Authority as this do the Editors found their Innovations; but till they can produce more authentick Proofs for what they affirm, they ought to excuſe any Man's Belief.

The Two next Popes after *Gregory* X *viz. Innocent* V. and *Hadrian* V. ſat but Six Months; and therefore little can be ſaid of them: Nor was the Pontifical Chair enjoy'd much longer by

[1277.] *John* XXI. before called *Peter Julian*, a Man well vers'd in all Kinds of Learning, eſpecially Phyſick, wherein he acquir'd great Reputation: Laying which aſide, he enter'd into Holy Orders, and became ſoon after Cardinal Biſhop of *Tuſculum*; from whence, upon the Death of *Hadrian* V. he was promoted to the See of *Rome*: And, notwithſtanding the great Weight of Buſineſs which attends that Promotion, he cloſely follow'd his Studies; for he wrote a Treatiſe called, *The Poor Man's Treaſure*; and ſeveral Tracts of Logick and other Things. He was mightily delighted with Aſtrology, and the Art of calculating Nativities; in which he went ſo far as to draw his own Horoſcope, which promis'd him a long Life; but his Infallibility was much miſtaken; for at the ſame Time the Roof of the Chamber falling in, he was miſerably bruiſed, in which Condition he languiſh'd a while, and then dy'd. The Editors, *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 1030. from *Siffrid*, *l.* 2. tells us, That this Pope was writing a certain Heretical Book at the Time that he was kill'd by the Fall of the Roof. *Which*, ſay they, *if true, ſhews the great Providence by which God governs his Church.* Which, I ſuppoſe, they mean in the juſt Judgment of God upon this Heretical Pope.

[1277.] *John Cajetan*, Cardinal-Deacon of S. *Nicolaq*, after a Vacancy of Six Months, and

much Difficulty, takes Possession of the Apostolick See under the Name of *Nicolas* III. His chief Opponent was *Charles* King of *Sicily*, Senator of *Rome*, and President of the Holy Chamber; who earnestly insisted upon the Election of a *Frenchman*; but *Cajetan*'s Interest being superior to King *Charles*'s, he ascends the Papal Throne, and to make *Charles* sensible of the Pontifical Resentment, in the Beginning of his Reign, he deprives him of the Vicarship of *Hetruria*, and the Senatorial Dignity; with a strict Injunction, that no Prince for the future should assume that Honour.

In the Year 1279, a Council was held at *Buda* in *Hungary*, in which one *Philip*, Legate to Pope *Nicolas* III. presided. In Pursuance of the Act of Image-Worship, before establish'd by the Bishop of *Rome*, the Thirteenth Canon of this Council obliges all Clergymen, when they appear before the Figure or Image of the Blessed Virgin, or the Crucifix, to bow their Heads, and instruct the Laity to do the like. Likewise, when they hear the *Ave Mary* pronounc'd, they are to kneel.

The Year following a Council was held at *Santon*, in the Seventh Canon of which the Adoration of the Eucharist is injoin'd the Laity; obliging them, wherever they shall see the Body of Christ carried, they shall kneel and pray.

[1281.] *Martin* II. or, as some will, IV. before called *Simon de Bria*, succeeds *Nicolas* III. of whom there is little said by the Editors. The most remarkable Thing during his Pontificate was the Council of *Nismes*, *A. D.* 1284, in which the old Error of Lay-Baptism, unjustly father'd on the Fourth Council of *Carthage*, *A. D* 398, (to which I refer the Reader) is reviv'd, and amply enlarg'd and confirm'd in the First Canon. The Ninety ninth and One hundredth Canons of the Fourth Coun-

Council of *Carthage*, positively forbid a Woman to teach and baptize, tho' *Gratian* and *Peter Lombard* have unjustly added an Exception to the latter, *nisi urgente Necessitate*, which never belong'd to it. *Binius*, *Longus a Coriolano*, and *Labbée*, tho' they leave out the Exception mentioned by *Gratian* and *Peter Lombard*, strenuously assert the Article of Baptism by Lay-Hands *in Case of Necessity*. With them *Bellarmine*, *de Baptismo*, *l.* 1. *c.* 7. joins; to which Forgery they add another in their Notes, at least it is imply'd in them; for they say, *By a Woman being forbid to baptize, is only meant in the Presence of the Priests or Clergy, as appears from the preceding Canon; or except in Case of Necessity, as* Peter Lombard *and* Gratian *expound this Canon. For as the Apostle* Paul, 1 Cor. c. 14. & 1 Tim. c. 2. *forbids Women, except in Case of Necessity, to teach or speak; so the Fathers of this Council permit Women in Case of Necessity to baptize, no Priest or Clergyman being present. Since therefore the Power of Baptizing is forbid to Women, except in Case of Necessity, we may very justly object the Determination of the Council of* Florence *against* Calvin; *that not only the Clergy but the Laity, not only Men but Women, have Power in Case of Necessity to administer the Sacrament of Baptism, though contrary to the solemn Præscripts of the Church.* Thus the Notes. In which there is a Mass of Absurdities, Forgeries, and Lies, too gross for the most bigotted Inclination. For, in the first Place, to say, that by Women's being forbid to baptize, is only meant in the Presence of the Clergy, is the most distorted Explanation, and most opposite to the Text, that can be invented; which positively in these few Words says, *A Woman shall not baptize*; which can admit of no other Meaning than what the Words express. Secondly, they are very impolitick to impose so palpable a Forgery on the World, as in these Words [as appears from the

preceding Canon.] After this Way of arguing, they would perſuade the World into an Opinion of Impudence, and that it is a Virtue, or they would not dare to juſtify their falſe Interpretations by ſo direct Forgeries. The *preceding Canon* they mention is very wide of the Matter; for that forbids Lay-Men to teach in the Preſence of the Clergy, except at the Command of the Clergy. What the Canon in Diſpute ſpeaks of, is Baptizing, which is the Adminiſtration of a Sacrament; ſo that this is nothing to their Purpoſe. They have indeed taken an unwarrantable Freedom of augmenting the Number of the Sacraments, but this of Teaching has not yet come within their Catalogue. But, Thirdly, as one Miſchief is uſually attended with another, ſo in this Caſe, to ſtrengthen one Falſity, they introduce another. They affirm, That St. *Paul* allows Women in Caſe of Neceſſity to baptize, 1 *Cor.* 14. 1 *Tim.* 2. and from thence juſtify this Forgery of *Gratian* and *Peter Lombard.* How falſe this is, and how impiouſly they have traduc'd the Great Apoſtle, let the Reader judge from the two Epiſtles cited. In 1 *Cor. c.* 14. *v.* 34, 35. St. *Paul* ſays, *Let your Women keep Silence in the Churches, for it is not permitted unto them to ſpeak, but to be ſubject, as the Law alſo ſaith. And, if they will learn any Thing, let them ask their Husbands at Home; for it is a Shame for Women to ſpeak in the Church.* And in 1 *Tim. c.* 2. *v.* 11, 12. he ſays, *Let the Woman learn in Silence with all Subjection. I permit not a Woman to teach, neither to uſurp Authority over the Man, but to be in Silence.* Theſe Texts are plain and poſitive; and it is very unlikely St. *Paul* ſhould in any Part of the Context contradict himſelf; as it is moſt certain he doth not.

But to return to the Council of *Niſmes*: The Firſt Canon of which not only corroborates, but en-

enlarges the Liberty of Lay-Baptism, by impowering them to use the Form of Words prescrib'd in the Office of Baptism, *viz.* In the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, I baptize thee: And if a Priest shall find an Infant thus baptiz'd by Lay-Hands, Man or Woman, Father or Mother, in Case of Necessity, it shall be esteem'd valid, and he shall not rebaptize the Child. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 1201, 1202. The Unreasonableness of this Practice makes the Fact invalid. For if the Laity assume the Office of the Priesthood, as they are unqualified, the Act of Baptism is in it self null; and consequently the Infant or Person so baptiz'd is not the better for it; but is as much, in the Case of Baptism, left to the Mercy of God, as it would be if it should die without it. It is the Commission, the lawful Call alone, that justifies the Agent in his Office; and, as in all other Cases, so in this, he that acts without a Commission or lawful Power is an Impostor, and all his Acts are ineffectual and void in themselves.

[1285.] *Honorius* IV. before called *Jacobus de Subello*, is from Cardinal-Deacon in *Cosmedin* promoted to the Papal Dignity. In whose Time, in the Council of *Wirtzburg*, called *Concilium Herbipolense*, and held *A. D.* 1287. the Adoration of the Host, which we mentioned just before in the Council of *Santon*, is more expresly injoin'd than before. This Council was intirely the Pope's, for *John* of *Tusculum* his Legate presided in it; and to add to the Solemnity of it, *Rodolph* the Emperor, with several of the *German* Nobility, was present at it. The Eighth Chapter or Canon enjoins the Method of the Procession and Adoration in these Words. "When it shall happen that the most Holy Body "of Christ is carried out of the Body of the Church "to sick Persons, or Women near their Time of

De-

"Delivery, we demand a due Veneration of it; "*viz.* the Prieſt, having his Surplice on, and his "Stole about his Neck, ſhall carry it, if the Cir-"cumſtance of Time and Place will permit, a "Clerk going before with a Taper and a little "Bell; and they that meet the Hoſt are to kneel "while the Prieſt paſſes by, and devoutly ſay "Three Pater-noſter's at leaſt, with the Salutation "of the Bleſſed Virgin: And thoſe of them who "perform this Injunction, that ſhall be under Pen-"nance or Confeſſion at that Time, ſhall, by Vir-"tue of our Authority, have Ten Days of their "Pennance remitted: And the Prieſt who ſhall "preſume to carry the Hoſt otherwiſe, ſhall be "puniſh'd at the Will of his Ordinary. *Con. T.* 11. "*Par.* 2. *p.* 1322.

[1288.] *Nicolas* IV. otherwiſe called *Jerome*, was the greateſt Ornament of the Pontifical Chair for many Ages, being eminent for his Piety and Learning. He was ſollicitous for the promoting a good Underſtanding among Chriſtian Princes, witneſs his reconciling the Kings of *Arragon* and *Naples*; and indefatigably ſedulous in propagating the Chriſtian Religion among the *Tartars*, *Armenians*, and *Æthiopians*, with the firſt of which he did not loſe his Labour. He earneſtly preſs'd the *Chriſtian* Princes for the Relief of what was left of the Holy-Land, ſetting them a glorious Example in himſelf, by ſending a great Number of Men at his own Charge. King *Edward* I. of *England*, ſtimulated by ſo fair a Precedent, calls a Council at *London*, in which having decreed the Extirpation of the *Jews* out of his Country, he calls upon the Clergy for a Subſidy towards carrying on the War in the Holy-Land; but tacked an Injunction to it, That no Perſon ſhould give any Eſtate to the Monks, or ſell any Poſſeſſions to them, or any other Prieſts, (being

(being sensible or jealous of their present and growing Greatness.) Pope *Nicolas*, too much in Imitation of his Predecessors, interposes by his Legate *Bernard*, and obliges the King to recall this Act. He was, in short, not only learned, but a great Patron of Learning and learned Men.

[1294.] After a Vacancy of above two Years, *Peter Moronens*, an Anchorite, is chosen Pope by the Name of *Celestine* V. a Man of great Simplicity and Easiness; so ready to grant, says the Author of his Life, *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1364, that rather than fail he would promise the same Thing to two Persons. He was, without Question, a great Stranger to the World, and Secular Affairs, or he had not so easily been deluded by his Successor Cardinal *Cajetan*, who by a nocturnal Stratagem terrified him into an Abdication or voluntary Resignation. The Editors, in the Life of *Celestine* and his Successor *Boniface* VIII. are very tender of this Point. In the First, *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1364, they tell us, " That *Celestine*, by reason of the great " Weight of Affairs, and his own Want of Experience, finding himself unfit for so important " an Administration, determin'd to resign; which " Resolution of his Cardinal *Cajetan* so encourag'd, " that, notwithstanding *Charles* King of *Sicily* endeavour'd all he could to dissuade the Pope from " abdicating, he voluntarily quitted the Chair in " the Sixth Month of his Pontificate." In the Life of *Boniface* VIII. they say, " He was chosen in the " Room of *Celestine*, who resign'd." *Ib. p.* 1397. Thus they varnish over the most concerted Cheat that ever was practis'd with the Sham of Abdication, a good Word too often misapplied. The Truth is this: Cardinal *Cajetan* (whom the Editors own, *ibid.* to be a Man extreamly arrogant and ambitious) taking the Advantage of poor *Celestine*'s

Easi-

Easiness and Simplicity, enters his Apartment by Night, and in a feign'd Voice, pretending from Heaven, advises him to resign: Which he, taking it for a real Vision, accordingly did; and *Cajetan* is by the Name of

[1294.] *Boniface* VIII. elected in his Room; who is no sooner possess'd of the Chair, but, to secure his ill-gotten Greatness, resolves to make sure Work, and prevent his Predecessor from resuming the Papal Dignity, by imprisoning the deluded *Celestine*, who thought of nothing more than retiring to his former Solitude, in which Confinement he died of Grief. At the Inauguration of *Boniface* two surprising Omens happen'd, which plainly foretold the turbulent Genius of the Man. The First was as he pass'd to his Coronation; when a sudden Darkness, and violent Storm arose, that blew out the Lamps and Tapers in the Church. The Second was upon his Return from the Church, when, a Tumult happening among the People, above Forty Men were slain. The Ceremony being over, to expose the Weakness and Fallibility of his two last Predecessors *Nicolas* and *Celestine*, he rescinds the Indulto's and Favours granted by them. And to shew his implacable Hatred to the *Gibelline* and *Columnensian* Factions, he persecutes them with the utmost Severity; not only divesting *James* and *Peter*, whom Pope *Celestine* had created Cardinals, of the Sacred Purple, but despoiling them of all their Wealth and Possessions, and subjecting them to Excommunication. In the Year 1297, in a haughty imperious Manner, he commands *James* King of *Arragon* to invade *Sicily*, and depose his Brother *Friderie*; who resolutely maintaining his Right, and the *Sicilian* Nobility supporting him, the good Man curses them heartily, and puts the Kingdom of *Sicily* under an Interdict: And where-

as

as it was customary with the Bishops of *Rome*, for the Offences of Princes, to forbid the Use of the Sacraments and other Holy Offices in their Dominions, Pope *Boniface*, *A. D.* 1298, puts out a declaratory Constitution, instructing both Clergy and Laity how to behave themseves under an Interdict. This unnatural Act in arbitrarily commanding one Brother to invade another, and cursing and interdicting Subjects for being faithful and obedient to their lawful Soverign, is alone sufficient to create an Abhorrence in all Men; and yet the Editors, tho' they call this Pope *supra Modum ambitiosus & arrogans*, do in the preceding Words to these call him, *Rerum Experientia laudabilis*, *ibid.* 1297.

His haughty Behaviour to crown'd Heads was insupportable, for he was not content with the Supremacy in Spirituals, but claim'd the Right of disposing of Temporal Kingdoms. This is plain from the Claim he laid to *Scotland*, as appears from his Letter to our King *Edward* I. which he sent to *Robert* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, obliging him upon Pain of Suspension *ab Officio & Beneficio*, to deliver his Letter to the King, and earnestly press him to acquiesce to his Demands. This Letter indeed, is not written with the usal Air of Domineering and Threatning; but, after a long Preamble of the Right of his Claim to the Kingdom of *Scotland*, he positively declares, *Regnum Scotiæ ad Ecclesiam Romanam pertinere*: *That the Kingdom of* Scotland *belong'd to the Church of* Rome, *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1401. King *Edward* I. with great Respect and good Manners answers the Pope, makes out his Claim, and persists in his Right; and so the Editors leave it. But with *Philip the Fair* of *France* he dealt quite otherwise; for he demanded feudal Obedience of *Philip*, which he disdaining to comply with, return'd

turn'd this contumelious Answer to his insolent Demand, *Sciat tua maxima Fatuitas, &c.* a Reply not a little grating to his haughty Holiness. But for this Pope *Boniface* is not long in his Debt; for the Quarrel between them encreasing upon *Philip's* forbidding any of his Subjects going to the Court of *Rome*, or sending any Money thither, the Pope calls a Council, excommunicates King *Philip*, absolves his Subjects from their Allegiance to him, and transfers his Kingdom to the Emperor *Albert*. As to the Excommunication of King *Philip*, the Editors cannot agree. In the Life of Pope *Boniface* VIII. they affirm he did excommunicate him. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1398. But in the Margin *Cossart* falls foul on *Binius*, and says it is a Mistake of his, referring to a Note of his own, *ibid. p.* 1477. where, instead of charging *Binius* with the Mistake, he makes it out that this Pope did excommunicate King *Philip*. For he says, that there was nothing done against *Philip* by Name, but that, as hindering the *Gallican* Bishops from going to *Rome* to attend at the Council called by Pope *Boniface*, he was involv'd in those Sentences generally pronounc'd against those that shall hinder Access to the supream Pontiff; which of Course implies Excommunication. But of this more in the Council of *Paris*, 1303.

This Pope was the first that instituted the Sacred Year at *Rome* called the Jubilee; at which there was a prodigious Confluence of People, and where, the first Day appearing in his Pontifical Habit, he bless'd the People; the Second Day he appeared in an Imperial Habit, with a Crown on his Head, and a naked Sword being carried before him, he called out, *Behold the Two Swords*, meaning the Ecclesiastick and Temporal. *Chron. Uspergens. post Crantzium Continuat. p.* 262. Upon which, say the Histo-

 rians

rians that relate this, as amaz'd at his Arrogance, *Thou seest*, O Peter, *thy Successor*; *and thou*, O *Saviour Christ*, *behold thy Vicar*: *See to what Height the Pride of the Servant of thy Servants is arrived!* But it is Time to bring this Monster to his End. After a Reign of Eight Years and as many Months, certain Cardinals of the *Gibelline* Faction prevaling, and the World growing weary of the Tyrant, a Party of 300 Horse is dispatch'd to *Anagnia*, where his Holiness is detain'd a Prisoner for three Days; but being rescu'd by the Citizens, he arrived at *Rome*; where thirty Days after he died miserably. His whole Pontificate was one continued Series of Pride and Tyranny, and his Character so vile and black, that none but the Editors in their Account of his Life offer the lest Shadow of Good in his Favour. Nay *John Stella*, who, in his Commentary on the Lives and Manners of the *Roman* Pontiffs, is wont to flatter the very worst of Popes and Men, particularly *Alexander* VI. and *Julius* II. calls Pope *Boniface* VIII. crafty, most ungrateful, arbitrary, arrogant and wicked. But besides what others say of him, there is nothing shews his unbounded Desire, and insatiable Thirst of Power, and promoting the Majesty of the Pontifical See more than that one Clause of his Decretal *de Majorat. & Obedient. Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanæ Creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus, & pronunciamus omnino esse de Necessitate Salutis. Extravag. Commun. Lib.* 1. *Tit.*8. *c.* 1. Making Obedience from all Creatures living to the See of *Rome* an Article of Salvation. Certainly there never was a greater Complication of Ambition, Craft, Treachery and Tyranny, in any one Man, than in this Pope; whose infamous Life justly drew this Proverbial Saying on him in after-Times, *That he crept into the Papacy like a Fox, rul'd like a Lion, and died like a Dog.*

In

In the Seventh Year of Pope *Boniface*'s Pontificate, *viz. A. D.* 1300. there were several Councils held, which speak highly in Favour of the Supremacy, and confirm several unjustifiable Innovations, and former Corruptions in the Church. Particularly the Councils of *Melun*, *Colon*, and *Baieux*. In the Fourth Canon of the Council of *Colon*, Pluralities, so much inveigh'd against before, are allow'd with the Apostolick Dispensation; too leading a Precedent for the many uncanonical Abuses practis'd afterwards in holding Plurality, not only of Parochial, but Cathedral Churches. The Fifth and Sixth Canons are very pressing to the People to bequeath Legacies to the Church and Poor. Which undoubtedly tend very much to the Promotion of Religion and Charity; but the Seventh Canon, which remits Twenty Days of Pennance injoin'd, to the Person that shall bequeath any Thing to the Church, makes the Inducement to this Act conditional, and savours too much of Popish Compact, and Personal Merit; for, if Heaven were to be brib'd, Who would not on his Sick Bed give all he has to secure Eternal Rest? Which to encourage the more, the Eighth Canon says, That every one may make his Will in Sickness, and whatever Propriety he shall bequeath, he shall enjoy the Use of it whilst he lives. Legacies to the Church and Poor are unquestionably great Acts of Devotion; but God only, who can measure the Will and Intent of the Donor, is Judge of the Merit; for to remit Pennances for a Pecuniary Mulct, or to proportion them to the Quality of Legacies, savours of Secular Interest and Avarice.

The Fourth Canon of the Council of *Baieux* is a Renovation of the old Corruption of Baptism: which is here allow'd by Lay-Hands, either of

Men

Men or Women, in case of Necessity; of which having spoken at large before, I shall only add, that least this Innovation should pass unimprov'd, they have in this Canon rack'd some superfluous Unnecessaries to it, such as the *Pabulum Salis*, the *Aurium Limitio cum Saliva*.

The Eighth Canon of this Council introduces the Elevation of the Host, which is perform'd by the Priest in the Celebration of Mass; and when he comes to the Words, *This is my Body*, then he is decently to elevate it, that it may be seen of all present. And after the taking of the Eucharist, they are to forbear Spitting; which if they cannot do, they must spit in a clean Place, which cannot be trodden upon.

The Ninth Canon says, If any Part of the Wine, (which, since the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, they call the Blood of Christ) fall upon the Altar-Cloth, the Altar-Cloth shall be wrap'd up in a clean Cloth, and preserv'd among the Relicks. And if it should drop or fall upon any other Holy Vestment, the Part which is tinq'd with it shall be cut off and burnt, and the Ashes be preserv'd in the Holy Repository. Likewise if it fall upon any Wood, Stone, or the Ground, the Place shall be scrap'd, and the Dust preserv'd in the Repository. No Wonder, indeed, that they abound so in Relicks! A most exact Decency ought to be observ'd in the Performance of all Holy Offices; but these are Niceties even to Ridicule.

In the Year 1302, a Council was held at *Pennafi-l* in *Spain*, in which several ancient Canons were reviv'd relating to Ecclesiastick Discipline; and amongst them some of Pope *Boniface*'s Constitutions; but the 11th and 12th Chapters are the most ridiculous Instances of Superstition, that the most fabulous Legend ever yet produc'd. The 11th

Chapter constitutes the Feast of St. *Ildephonse*, formerly Archbishop of *Toledo*, upon this Occasion; which we'l relate in the Words of the Canon. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *in Append.* p. 2449. "Because the "Mother of our Lord Jesus, after her Assumption "into Heaven, descended from thence, and corpo- "really visited the Blessed *Ildephonse*, who had been "Prelate of the Patriarchal Church of *Toledo*, and "endow'd him with many rich Gifts; in Memory "of the special Love of the Mother of God, and "those whom she thus Honours, we constitute and "ordain a Feast to be solemnly celebrated through- "out the whole Province of *Toledo*." I shall not trouble my self or the Reader with any Disquisition about the Blessed Virgin's Assumption to, or Descension from Heaven, or what Presents she brought down with her to bestow upon *Ildephonse*; for which the Editors can produce no Proof, but from their *Pseudo-Evangelia*, and Sham-Legends, Authorities too gross for any but such biggoted Capacities to admit, whose easy Credulity deprives them of the Use of their Reason. The 12th Chapter is as gross an Imposition as the former; but for the Blasphemy and Prophaneness exceeds it, and runs thus: "Humane Nature being "so frail thro' its Corruption, that it cannot live "without Sin; next to our Lord, our only Recourse "is to the ever-glorious Virgin, whom we are bound "to regard as the Mother of Mercies; therefore we "appoint, that every Day the Hymn *Salve Regina* be "be sung in all Churches, *&c.*" This is interfering with the great Attribute of Mercy, and making the Virgin *Mary* equal to the Godhead in the Distribution of it; expressly contrary to the Doctrine of Christianity laid down by our Blessed Saviour, his Disciples and Apostles, and the Practice of it in the most primitive and pure Times. God is the Fountain of Mercies, who, thro' his Love to the World,

gave

gave his Only Begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in him should not perish, but have Everlasting Life. *John* 3. 16. The Blessed Saviour of the World invites all that travel and are heavy laden to come to himself [not to any other] for Refreshment. *Mat.* 11. 28. St. *Paul* says, 1 *Tim.* 1 15. That it was Jesus Christ which came into the World to save Sinners; and St. *John*, *Ep.* 1. *c.* 2. *v.* 1. tells us, Our Advocate with the Father is Jesus Christ the Righteous, who is the Propitiation of our Sins. In short, the Virgin *Mary* is no where mentioned by the Disciples and Apostles in the Gospels or Epistles, nor in any Creed, with any other Mark of Honour than that of being, in the Flesh, the Mother of our Blessed Lord; who alone is our Advocate and Mediator to the Throne of Grace; no Access to the Father of Mercies, but thro' his Intercession. How ridiculous and Monstrous then is this deifying and crowning departed Souls, and profanely investing them with the Attributes of God the Father and Son?

The next Year, on the Tenth of *April*, *Philip the Fair* calls a Council, or rather an Ecclesiastico-Political Convention; at which he commanded all Barons and Governors of Cities, as well as Prelates and Clergy, to be present: In which, to revenge the Insults offer'd their King by the Pope, they charge him with *Simony*, *Usury*, *Homicide* and *Heresy*; unanimously decreeing, that he ought to be excommunicated, and deposed the Papal Dignity. The Editors, in their Account of this Council, relate the Matter partially and imperfectly, abruptly breaking off with the Consent of the Barons and other Laicks only to this Decree, (tho' all unanimously agreed to it) and then proceed to the Letters of the *Gallican* Bishops, as if they declin'd what the rest had resolv'd: Whereas the Letters of the aforesaid Bishops are no more than a Remonstrance to the Pope, whom with the utmost

Deference and Regard they intreat to revoke his Edict, wherein he demands Subjection from *Philip* to him, as his Temporal Superior; putting him in Mind of the Allegiance they ow'd to their King, whose Person and Honour, as well as the Liberties and Laws of his Kingdom, they were by Oath bound to maintain; and demonstrating the Hazard of the Peace both of Church and State upon this unhappy Difference between their King and him. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1475, 1476. How glorious a Clergy was this Prince and Church bless'd with, whose stedfast Loyalty the subtil Artifices, and open Menaces of the Bishop of *Rome* could not shake or warp! These undue Methods, and unjustifyable Proceedings, made *Philip* look about him, and, to prevent the Bishop of *Rome*'s incroaching in Spirituals in his Dominions, he takes upon him to dispose of all Ecclesiastick Titles in the *Gallican* Church. Thus the private Insinuations, and open Attempts of the *Roman* Pontiff in Temporals, threw the *Gallican* Church out of one Vassalage into another; the Regale snatching that from the Pontificate which properly belong'd to neither.

[1303.] *Nicolas* Bishop of *Ostia*, upon the Death of Pope *Boniface* VIII. assumes the Papal Dignity, under the Name of *Benedict* IX. or, as some will, XI. whom the Editors call Antipope, though *Cabbassutius*, *Eccl. Notit.* *p.* 497. and in his Chronological Index, carries on the Succession smoothly, without any Schismatical Interruption, calling him, *Vir apprime doctus & pius*. To correct the Irregularities of his Predecessor, he rescinds several of his Acts, particularly the Excommunication of King *Philip*, whom he absolves. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1477. This *Cabbassutius* slightly and falsly glosses over, *p. ibid.* saying, that he only renew'd Peace between *Philip* and the *Franks*. For which he can have no true Ground; for it is plain that *Philip* and his Subjects were at Peace, they all, both

both Ecclesiasticks and Laicks, unanimously consented to his Decrees against Pope *Boniface*, as appears from the Remonstrance of the *Gallican* Bishops to him. *Benedict*'s Reign being but short, continuing little more than Eight Months, little can be expected. We shall therefore pass on to his Successor,

[1305.] *Bertrand Gotto*, who upon his Accession to the Pontificate changes his Name to that of *Clement* V. He was a *Frenchman* by Nation, being born in the Province of *Burdeaux*, of which he was by Pope *Boniface* VIII. created Archbishop, and from whence he was translated to the See of *Rome*; tho' at the Time of his Election by the Conclave at *Rome*, he was resident at *Burdeaux*. Being elected, he summon'd all the Cardinals to *Lyons*; where, in the Presence of King *Philip*, his Brother, and the Duke of *Brittany*, he was crown'd. He translated the See of *Rome* to *Poitiers*, residing sometimes at *Lyons*, sometimes at *Burdeaux*, but chiefly at *Avignon*, where it continued near Seventy two Years. *Platina*, p. 451. gives the Reason of this Translation, viz. That it was upon the Account of the frequent Tumults in *Italy*, but does not say upon what Occasion. Which in Reality was from the Bishops of *Rome* assuming to themselves the Power of disposing of the Imperial Dignity, notwithstanding the Establishment of the Electoral College to the contrary many Years before. And tho' upon the Death of *Albert* of *Austria*, *Henry* Duke of *Luxemberg* was elected Emperor, yet this Pope would seem to have so much Part in the Election, that *Henry* must receive the Confirmation of the Election from him; which was upon Condition, that after Two Years he should go to *Rome*, and there take his Crown; his Holiness having delegated Three Cardinals there to administrate in his Absence. *Henry* accordingly presents himself to the Cardinal-Ministers at *Rome*; but refuses to take the Oath of Fidelity to

the Pope; which Disobedience cost him his Life; for *Bernard*, his Confessor, a Dominican Fryar, being suborn'd for that Purpose, with a poison'd Host dispatch'd him at the Siege of *Florence*, making the Blessed Viaticum a Vehicle of Destruction. This infamous Action *Cabbasutius*, p. 498. wretchedly endeavours to palliate, by urging the natural Infirmity of Body the Emperor *Henry* at that Time languish'd under, producing only Partizan-Authority to the contrary, from the Continuator of *Ptolomy Lucensis*, *Villanus*, *Florentinus*, and *Albertus Pasarinus*, which he ridiculously destroys, by urging the Design of Poisoning Pope *Victor* II. in the Holy Cup, which was miraculously discover'd by the Sub-Deacon. The Manner of relating this is very inconsistent with Reason; for, tho' it is possible a Subdeacon might be privy to such a Design, yet it is very preposterous to suppose he could any Way be concern'd in the Administration of it; Subdeacons having nothing to do in the Office of Consecrating or Administring either Element; and therefore, consequently, it must be a Priest that must be concern'd in this Fact; or, if the Pope himself had consecrated the Wine, still there is no Room left for a Subdeacon to be concern'd. But, granting the Story to be taken in a Sense most favourable to *Cabbasutius*'s Intention, it is foreign to the Matter; there being just as much Difference in the Case between an Emperor poison'd, and a Pope design'd to be poison'd, but escap'd; as between a Man murder'd, and one that had escap'd Murder. What else relates to this Pope, we shall take Notice of in the Councils during his Pontificate.

To make the Election of Pope *Clement* V. look plausible, the Editors have publish'd the Decree of his Election, sign'd by Seventeen Cardinals, in which they call Pope *Benedict*, *Sanctæ Memoriæ Papa*; tho' themselves, in the Life of him, call him Schismatick

and

and Antipope. To which they subjoin the Cardinal's Letter, to acquaint him with their Election of him. *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1497, 1498.

Clement, in the First Year of his Reign, publishes a *Manifesto* in Favour of King *Philip*; wherein he takes off Pope *Boniface* VIII.'s Bull against him, by which the King and all his Subjects had been excommunicated. *Ibid. p.* 1499.

In the Fifth Year of his Pontificate he calls a Council at *Presburg* in *Hungary*, in which Cardinal *Gentilis*, his Legate, presided. There were Nine Canons made at this Synod; the first and last of which begin with the usual Claim of Sovereignity over all. The first says, in the Apostolick See Christ laid the Foundation of the Catholick Faith; and that it is the Mother and Sovereign of all Christians. *Ibid. Part* 2. *p.* 2454. *in Append.* And the Ninth says, That the Apostolick See is by a singular Privilege propos'd to all as an Object of Obedience. *Ibid.* 2462. And lest these Two Canons, so highly declaratory of the Interest of the Pontifical Supremacy, should fail of their Force, they both enjoin strict Obedience to them from all Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Priors, *&c.* under Pain of most strict Censure of a Power that will make them sensible how dangerous it is to disobey. And to give them a more formal Sanction, Pope *Clemens* V. at *Avignon* confirms them by a particular Instrument for that Purpose. All this Stir was occasioned by the Obstinacy of the Archbishops, Bishops, and other Prelates of *Poland*; where the Sovereign Pontiff's Power had not now prevailed; for the Ninth Canon says, and complains, That some Bishops and Chapters in *Poland*, containing all Letters or Orders of the Apostolick See, and its Legates, about the receiving of Canons into their Churches, would not proceed therein without the Consent of their Superior. And therefore to enslave them to the See of *Rome*, as the Bishops

 thereof

thereof had done many other Churches of *Christendom*, this Council of *Presburg* was call'd, which answered the End it was intended for.

The Year following a Council was call'd at *Saltzburg*, in which *Conrade* Archbishop thereof, and Legate of Pope *Clement*, publishes a Constitution of his Holiness in Mitigation of one of Pope *Boniface* VIII, which I mention only because it is written in the same Style of Sovereignty as the former, claiming the Pastoral Care over all Christian Nations by Divine Injunction. *Ibid. p.* 1516. Thus we see the unjust Pretensions of the See of *Rome* to universal Power, (though never prov'd) by frequent Claims pass into an irrefragable Custom; and the slavish Submission of all or most Primates in *Europe*, who were either Legates or Creatures of the *Roman* Pontiff, gave him so uncontroulable a Power in all Christian Nations, that he could influence the Minds of their Kings to his Advantage upon any Occasion; witness his Letters to the Princes of *Germany*, *France*, *England*, *&c.* for the Extirpation of the Knights-Templars; who were become so numerous and powerful in the aforesaid Countries, and grown so exorbitant and irregular, that the good Man at *Rome*, more out of Jealousy of his own Power (which he found they every where despis'd) than any religious Design, resolves the total Subversion of their Order, lest others, in Imitation of them, should throw off the Yoke. In order to the Accomplishment of this Design, he attempts, by Provincial Synods in *England* and other Places, to open the Scene; where, by his special Direction and Command, he obliges each Primate to enquire into the Crimes charged upon the Knights Templars, exhibiting Articles of Inquisition against them. These Preliminaries being settled, and all Things prepared for a general Extinction of the Order in all Parts, Pope *Clement* V. calls a general Council at *Vienna* in *France*,

to

to which he summons the Attendance of the King of *France*, and Fifteen more, by their Ambassadors. The Letter which he wrote to *Philip* King of *France*, is the very same with that to each of the rest; which begins with the usual Claim of Supremacy, calling the Church of *Rome* the Mother of the Faithful, and Head and Sovereign of all other Churches; to the Government of which he affirms the Bishop of *Rome* to be deputed by Christ himself; and that none can be saved but they who practise the Doctrine delivered by the *Roman* Pontiff. *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1539. So that by this, if a Pope lapse into Heathenism, Heresy, Idolatry, Blasphemy, *&c.* (as many have done) they must be believed, and their Doctrine (though never so opposite to divine Precepts) become an Article of Salvation. The rest of this Letter contains the Charge against the Templars, and that very heavy; which, though it can strictly concern but some of that Fraternity, yet he extends it to the whole Order, the Subversion of which in the whole Process he seems resolutely bent upon: Though the natural Intent of all Ecclesiastical Synods, either Provincial or Oecumenical, was for Reformation of Irregularities, not for Extinction of Foundations; which is contrary to the Intent of the Institutors or Benefactors. Supposing the Charge of Heresy, Apostacy, *&c.* to be true, yet the Offence of a Part ought not to affect the Whole: And granting the Whole to be guilty of the Charge, there was no Necessity of extinguishing, but rather of reforming; especially considering the great Service this Order had done in Defence of the Holy City and Land; which this Letter of Pope *Clement* and the History of this Council acknowledge. The latter indeed urge the Disobedience of the Templars to the Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, from whom they received their first Benefits, as the first Article of their Charge. But the Editors ought to have considered,

that

that the Bishop of *Rome* lead the Way in this, by encroaching on the Patriarchate of *Jerusalem* himself, creating Patriarchs there, and making them but his Substitutes and Legates, (as we have already noted;) though it is plain from an infallible Text of Holy Scripture, that the First Bishop of *Jerusalem*, St. *James*, was President of a Council held there, and even in the Presence of St. *Peter*, pronounced the decretory Sentence, to which the rest of the Apostles agreed. *Act. Apost.* 15. And therefore the See of *Rome* had no Pretence to dispute Precedency with that of *Jerusalem* in the most early Times of Christianity.

But notwithstanding the high Crimes charged against the Templars in the Letters of Pope *Clement* to the several Kings and Prelates, and in his extinctory Sentence, *Cossart*, in his Addition to this Council of *Vienna*, *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1569. out of an anonymous MS. Author in the *Vatican*, seems to give the true Reason of this Severity against the Templars: "The First Session (says he) was for the Affair of "the Templars and their Order, which was grown "very scandalous, by reason of the diverse Heresies "and Errors crept in among them: The Second, "about sending Aid to the Holy-Land: The Third, "for Reformation of Manners, and the State of the "Church." But, continues the same Author, (and which is the Point that gives the true Light into the Affair of the Templars, for the rest were but distant Pretences for calling this Council:) "The Pope, "with several Prelates and Cardinals, in a private "Consistory, had resolved upon the Dissolution of "the Order of the Templars: And the extinctory "Decree was on the 3d Day of *April*, 1312. open-"ly proclaim'd and confirm'd in the Presence of "King *Philip*, (*cui negotium erat cordi*; *who was mighti-"ly pleas'd with the Business*) his Three Sons, and his "Brother *Charles*." So that this whole Affair seems

to

ſo be carried on againſt the Templars more to gratify the King than out of any particular Regard to their Irregularities; for not only the King of *France*, but other Princes, grew weary of them; none of which had ſo fortunate an Opportunity to extirpate them as *Philip*; for *Clement* V. was a *French*-man; and no Doubt the Tranſlation of the Papal Chair from *Rome* to *Avignon* was upon no ſlight Obligation. But the clancular Conſiſtory, wherein the Pope diſſolv'd the Order of Templars, and the Hint which the aforeſaid anonymous Author gives, of the great Satisfaction the publiſhing of the extinctory Sentence againſt the Templars gave to King *Philip*, plainly point out the Perſon chiefly affected and moſt highly gratified in the Diſſolution and Extirpation of this Order. But this is not the only Inſtance of the Poſſeſſor of St. *Peter*'s Chair being a Tool of State. It's probable the Templars, by their Wealth and Numbers in moſt Parts of the Chriſtian World, might give Umbrage of Jealouſy, not only to the Civil Power, but to the Biſhop of *Rome*; and that many of them might be guilty of the Crimes charged upon them: But their Irregularities cannot juſtify the irregular Proceſſes againſt them; for though ſome were corrupt in their Morals, it cannot be ſuppos'd, that among ſo great a Number of Men, who were diſperſed in all Countries, there were none religious and virtuous among them: Or if they were all involved in this general Corruption of Manners, the Order it ſelf, and the primary Inſtitution of it, were ſtill the ſame; and they might have puniſhed the Delinquents without the Extinction of the Order. But there is ſtill a greater Hardſhip upon the Templars than what hath been mention'd. In all judicial Proceedings, the greateſt Criminal hath an equal Title to Juſtice with the moſt innocent: But in the Caſe of the Templars it was quite otherwiſe; for in the extinctory Sentence or

Decree, Pope *Clement* V. owns, "That they could "not legally, according to the Inquisition and Pro- "cess, pronounce a difinitive Sentence against them; "and therefore, by Way of Provision, or Apostolick Ordination, they pronounc'd Sentence with "an irrefragable and perpetual Sanction, forbidding "any Person for the future to enter into the Templars Order, or take the Habit upon them, under "Pain of *ipso facto* Excommunication." *Ibid. p.* 1557. Here was the highest Injustice, without the left Pretence of Right; for if there was no Law to condemn them, the whole Proceeding was arbitrary and unjust, and his Holiness, notwithstanding his Infallibility, very much mistaken. But this might possibly be done with another Design; and the Power, which the extinctory Sentence calls *Provision*, or *Apostolick Ordination*, was by the Supream Pontiff exerted for no other End than to shew, That St. *Peter*'s Chair was not to be circumscrib'd within the Scanty Bounds of Justice; but, Right or Wrong, to extend its Supremacy in all Places, or over all Persons, and upon any Occasion.

But how positive soever the Pope and his Partizans were the next Year in the Council of *Tarragona*, which the Editors wholly omit, upon Enquiry, the Innocence of the Templars appear'd, and they were to be restor'd to their Habitations and the Privileges of their Order, only to be in Subjection to the Bishop of the Place they liv'd in. *Card. d'Aguire, Con. Hisp. T.* 3: *p.* 549

A. D. 1311. a Council was held at *Ravenna* by *Reynold* Archbishop thereof. In the Proeme to which he enjoins a plenary Observance of all Constitutions, Canons, Decretal Epistles of Popes, and Legatine Constitutions; and then subjoins Thirty two Canons; among which, some old Superstitions of the *Roman* Church are reinforced, and several ridiculous Superfluities

fluities added. The Third and Fourth enjoin the Anniversary Solemnities for the Souls of defunct Bishops, Patrons, Benefactors of Churches, *&c.* The Eighth, among the several Utensils of the Church, mentions the Little Bell, being highly useful and necessary to stir up the Minds of the People to their Devotion, and drive away evil Spirits; which Bells the Canon orders to be bless'd according to the Solemnity prescrib'd in the pontifical ridiculous Superstition! The Eleventh Canon obliges all the Faithful to remember the Form of Words us'd in Baptism, that they may not be unprovided in case of Extremity. But of this we have spoken before. The Fourteenth, speaking expressly of the Non-exempts of the Order of St. *Benedict*, plainly implies the Exemption of other Regulars from the Censure of this Council, though Provincial: But the Twenty fourth is more plain, for obliging all Clergy to produce a Licence from their proper Diocesan upon their Admission into Orders from another, it excepts the Order of the Mendicants and other privileged Persons.

A. D. 1314. another Council was held at *Ravenna*, by the same *Raynold*, Archbishop, and his Suffragans; wherein several of the Canons of the Council of *Ravenna*, *A. D.* 1311. are repeated and confirmed. But the Preface being very particular, I shall give the Reader a Taste of the Temper and Inclination of the foresaid Archbishop *Raynold*, who was a Creature of the Pontificate, and its modern Doctrines and Opinions; as appears very plainly from this Passage: *Nos Raynoldus, Permissione Divinâ, & Apostolicæ Sedis Gratiâ, sanctæ Ravennatis Ecclesiæ Archiepiscopus, ad Honorem omnipotentis Dei, beatorum Petri & Pauli Apostolorum ejus, beati Apollinaris Patroni, sanctorum Martyrum Vitalis & Ursicini, ac aliorum Martyrum & Confessorum, quorum Meritis & Precibus, in divin. ipsa Ecclesia*

Raven-

Ravennas, immo omnes Cathedrales Ecclesiæ, ac aliæ venerabiles de Provincia sunt fundatæ & dotatæ, &c. Nor is the Dependance of this See on that of *Rome* only mentioned here, but frequently in the Canons of this Council; particularly in the Twelfth Canon, where they allow the Dispensation of the Apostolick See, in collating Persons far under Age, as those of Sixteen Years old, to Ecclesiastical Benefices that require Priests Orders The Fourteenth Canon is the same with the Eighth Canon of the former Council of *Ravenna*, about the Obligation on all People to remember the Form of Baptism in case of Distress. The Fifteenth is a Confirmation of a most ridiculous Superstition practised by the *Romanists* in their publick Confession at the Beginning of the Mass, in these Words: "I confess to God Almighty, to the Blessed Virgin *Mary*, to Blessed *Michael* the Archangel, "to Blessed *John* Baptist, to the Holy Apostles *Peter* "and *Paul*, and to all Saints." This Innovation is in it self so gross, that I shall not need to aggravate it by any Animadversion; for certainly our Supplicating the Almighty, through his Blessed Son's Intercession, is sufficient without any subordinate Assistance; especially when we are so frequently told in Holy Scripture, that we have but one Advocate with the Father, who is Jesus Christ. *Con. Tom.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1604, 1612, 1614, 1615.

[1316.] Pope *Clement* V. dying in the Year 1314, the Holy See was vacant Two Years. *Cabbassutius* well observes, That this Time was remarkable for the Miseries both of Church and State, occasioned by the Dissention of Electors. *Eccl. Not. p.* 458. *col.* 2. Upon the Death of the Emperor, *Henry* of *Luxembergh*, the Electors were divided, some being for *Frideric* Duke of *Austria*, others for *Lewis* Duke of *Bavaria*; which threw *Germany* into terrible Convulsions. After various Successes on both Sides, the Fortune

tune of War at best declar'd in Favour of *Lewis*, who, upon the Ruine of *Friderie*, (whom he defeated and took Prisoner) mounted the Imperial Throne, thereby putting an End to a Nine Years *Interregnum*. About the same Time, and by the same Sort of Dis agreement among the Spiritual Electors, the Apostolick See was vacant for Two Years and some Months, which, says *Cabbasutius*, *ibid.* was the Occasion of much Scandal and Offence to the Christian Religion. But this the Infallibility of the Chair wip'd off, by supplying the Vacancy with *John* XXII. Which Election, how plausible soever some make it, was one of the most indirect irregular Proceedings that ever passed the Conclave. The Editors indeed are silent in the Manner of the Thing; but *Cabbasutius* is particular; which, in a Case so disadvantagious to the Pontificate, is very unexpected. Take it thus from the above-cited Page. " *James Deusa*, under the Name " of *John* XXII. on the 7th of the Ides of *August*, " is declared Pope at *Lyons* by the Brothers Preachers, " by whose Assistance *Philip* Count of *Poictou*, sum- " moning the Cardinals together, under Pretence of " advising with them upon some Emergency, sur- " prises and imprisons them; as had been before con- " certed between *Lewis* X. of *France* and his Bro- " ther *Philip* Count of *Poictou*, on purpose to conti- " nue the Apostolick Seat at *Avignon*; which could " not be more effectually brought about than " by choosing a *French*-man, (for such this Pope " *John* XXII. was) whom Count *Philip* obliges them " to choose, (notwithstanding his Promise of a free " Dismission of them) under the Necessity of Star- ving. Accordingly Pope *John* XXII. is declared; who, to appease the Minds of the Cardinals, desirous of restoring the Holy See to *Rome*, solemnly swears to them, that he would never mount a Horse or Mule, but in order to go to *Rome*. In the Begin-

ning

ning of his Pontificate he prosecutes the Quarrel begun by Pope *Clement* V. against *Lewis* of *Bavaria*, whom some of the Editors had chosen Emperor, setting up *Frideric* Duke of *Austria* in Opposition to him. But being frustrated in this Attempt by the Defeat of *Frideric*, he publickly summonseth *Lewis* to appear before him at *Avignon*, to account for his assuming the Title of Emperor without the Consent of the Pontifical Chair: Which *Lewis* refusing, and appealing to a Council, he and his Partisans are excommunicated by the Pope; who obliges the Bishop of *Prague*, in his Epistle to him, *Con. Tom.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1643. every Sunday and Holiday, publickly to declare *Lewis* excommunicate Heretick and Schismatick. Nor does he stop here; but, *More Romano*, deposes him, and commands the Electors to choose another in his Room. This the late Champion of the Pontificate *Cabbusutius* defends, *p.* 498. *col.* 2. affirming (though not proving) the Pope's Right of confirming the Emperor; and that *Lewis* was excommunicated for assuming the Title of Emperor without the Pope's Leave: And, *p.* 499. *col.* 1. that the Care and Administration of the Empire, in a Vacancy of Right, belonged to the Apostolick See. The *Romans* having in vain sollicited the Return of his Holiness, *A. D.* 1327. call in *Lewis*, who enters *Italy*, seizeth the Imperial Crown at *Rome*, calls a Council of Cardinals, and cites Pope *John*; who not appearing, is condemn'd as Antichrist, Satan, Arch-heretick, depos'd, and burnt in Effigie: And to be quit with Pope *John* in all Respects, he creates *Peter Corbarius*, a Minorite, Pope, by the Name of *Nicolas* V. All this while Pope *John* keeps close in *Avignon*, where he with Security despises the Threats and Attempts of *Lewis*; who returning into *Germany*, Pope *John* takes the Advantage, and with the Help of the *Pisans* soon subdues his Rival; obliging poor Pope

Nicolas to exchange the Papal Chair for a Prison, and soon after, Life for Death.

In the Life of this Pope the Editors are guilty of a great Reflection on the Infallibility of the Supream Bishop, *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1627. for they say he held an erroneous Opinion: But then they want not a Turn for this; for they say, that *Lactantius* and *Irenæus* led him into it. The Opinion which he held was, *That the Souls of the Blessed departed were detain'd in a certain Place till the Day of Judgment, and till then were not admitted to the Beatifick Vision.* This the Sorbonists condemn'd; and several others look'd upon it as an egregious Heresy: Which when Pope *John* heard, he intended to have interpos'd his Pontifical Authority, and determin'd the Question: But, says his Successor *Benedict*, he was prevented by Death. *Ibid.* But to take off still and lessen the Scandal of this erroneous Opinion, the Editors, *ibid.* tell us, That there was one *Occanus*, a Tributary of the Emperor, who being excommunicated by the Pope for certain Calumnies which he had cast upon the holy Man, openly declar'd, That these were the very Words of the Pope: "I never intended to say any "Thing contrary to the Faith; and if I have said "any such Thing, I renounce it." So that here is a fair Retractation of the false Doctrine; and his Holiness is *Rectus in Curia* again. But where's the Infallible Judge all this while! Besides this, there was a fierce Dispute between Pope *John* and the *Franciscans*. These affirmed, That Christ and his Apostles had nothing of their own Property, but enjoy'd all Things in common; and that not the Power over, but only the Use of some Things, properly belong'd to them; taxing those with Heresy that held the contrary Opinion. Good Pope *John*, to whom Money was as dear as his Soul, and who had heap'd up an immense Treasure, as appears from the Editors, *ibid.*

 could

could not digeſt the mortified Doctrines of Poverty and Want of Dominions, which he knew were utterly inconſiſtent with the Papal Dignity, and its vaſt Extent of Power; and therefore calling in the *Dominicans* to his Aſſiſtance, he condemns the foreſaid Doctrines as vain, fooliſh and heretical; affirming that our Bleſſed Lord was crucified with a Crown on his Head, and cloathed with Purple and ſplendid Garments, and that the Uſe and Property of Things could not be ſeparated from the Dominion, excommunicating the *Franciſcans*, and ſacrificing many of them to the Flames for oppoſing him.

During his Pontificate, which laſted 18 Years, there were many Councils held, to reinforce and confirm ſeveral ſuperſtitious Tenets, particularly the Fifth Council of *Ravenna*, *A. D.* 1317. under that faithful Creature of the Court of *Rome*, *Raynold* Archbiſhop of *Ravenna*, for the ſupporting Indulgences; the Firſt Council of *Avignon* for the ſame, *Cap.* 2. and the Council of *Marchena*, *Cap.* 43.

[1334.] *James Furnerius* ſucceeds his Uncle Pope *John* XXII. by the Name of *Benedict* XII. being elected the 20th of *December*, and crown'd the *January* following. At his Entrance on the Pontificate he condemns the *Franciſcans* of Hereſy, for aſſerting the Poverty of Chriſt, *&c.* But the Year after he condemns his Uncle Pope *John*'s Opinion, notwithſtanding his Infallibility, affirming, that tho' he was of the Number of Cardinals at the Time when his Predeceſſor, to whom the Determination of the Queſtion belong'd, propos'd, *That the Souls of the Faithful deceas'd, were not admitted to the Beatifick Viſion till the Reſurrection*; yet now, by Vertue of the Apoſtolick Authority, he is of another Opinion, and declares, *That the Souls of the Faithful are immediately after Death tranſlated to eternal Life and Reſt in Heaven, where they en-*

enjoy the Converſation of the Holy Angels with Chriſt, and inſtantly enjoy the Sight of the Divine Eſſence. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1793, 1794.

In the Fourth Year of his Pontificate, he revives the old Quarrel between his Uncle and the Emperor *Lewis*; who, notwithſtanding he earneſtly and often ſu'd for Abſolution, is not only excommunicated, and the former Cenſures againſt him confirm'd, but the Imperial Dignity declar'd vacant, and devolv'd upon him as Vicar of Chriſt. And, to preſerve *Italy* from the Invaſion of a foreign Enemy, he perſuades the Governors of Provinces, and others in Power, to ſhake off the Yoke of Obedience to their Prince, and govern by Vertue of their own Authority. [Tho' the Editors in the Life of this Pope, *ibid.* *p.* 1793. ſay, he created them Vicars of the Holy See.] And to ſecure himſelf againſt the Emperor, he perſuades the People of *Rome* to reſume the *Senatorian Dignity*, and govern independently of the Emperor: Who being highly incens'd by ſo many Injuries and Indignities, *A. D.* 1338, ſummonſeth a Convention at *Frankfort*; where, by the common Conſent of the Princes and Prelates, he ſets forth an Edict, in which he calls the Pope and his Adherents Phariſees and Antichriſts.

[1342.] *Petrus Rogerius*, another *Frenchman*, under the Name of *Clement* VI. takes Poſſeſſion of St. *Peter*'s Chair; who, in the Beginning of his Papacy, the better to keep in with the *Romans*, impatient of having the Chair reſtored to *Rome*, inſtitutes another Jubilee, to be kept every Fiftieth Year. He ſucceeds his Predeceſſors in their Reſentment againſt the Emperor *Lewis*, whom, notwithſtanding his repeated Inſtances for Reconciliation, he declares Heretick, and excommunicates; from which Sentence he was not to expect Abſolution but upon theſe Terms, *viz.* To de-

liver up *Occamus*, to cancel the Edicts he had made against the several Popes, to acknowledge the Empire to hold of the See of *Rome*, to own himself a Heretick, to divest himself of the Empire, and not to resume it without the Consent of the Pope. Which unreasonable Conditions the Emperor refusing, he is again, *A. D.* 1346. excommunicated, and the Electors commanded forthwith to choose another Emperor, or his Holiness would impose one on them. These impotent Menaces, instead of strengthening, did but infeeble the Power of the supreme Pontiff; the Decay of which was chiefly owing to these Two Causes: First, The Translation of the See from *Rome* to *Avignon*; Secondly, The frequent Quarrels between the Emperors and Popes. To which I may subjoin a Third, *viz.* The Schism that commenc'd upon the Death of *Gregory* XI. who restor'd the See to *Rome*. But of this in its Order of Time.

1. As to the First Cause of the Decay of the Pontifical Majesty, it is very plain from the Consequences: For *Clement* V. who was a Subject of *France*, and advanc'd to the Papal Dignity by the Interest of *Philip the Fair*, in Return, remov'd the See to *Avignon*; which gave Birth to Variety of Factions among the *Italians*, who were not a little discontented to see the Grandeur of *Rome* so diminish'd, and its Power enervated. But that which still contributed to the Lessening this Power, was Pope *Clement* V. and his Successors, whilst the See continued in *France*, becoming Tools and Creatures subservient to the Ends of the *French* Court; a great and undeniable Instance of which was the Council of *Viennna*, *A. D.* 1311. call'd on Purpose to gratify *Philip the Fair* with the Extirpation of the Order of *Knights Templers*; wherein it's plain he was but the *French* King's Instrument; tho' he acted as tyrannically as any Pope before or since in that Council; not asking or expecting the

Con-

Consent of the Council, but arbitrarily decreed the Extinction of the Order. 2. The Second Cause of the Decay of the Papal Majesty, was the many and unjust Quarrels with the Emperors, and other Princes, who upon every slight Occasion were excommunicated, and their Subjects exhorted, nay, commanded, to resist and depose them: Too many Instances of which the Histories of most Ages furnish us with. This made the several Princes fence against such unreasonable Encroachments of the Pontificate upon the Regale; which occasion'd uneasy Jealousies on both Sides, and those often broke out into open Feuds: And then his Holiness fulminates out his *Anathema's*; which Sentence, though in its self most dreadful, yet the frequent Repetition of it made it less terrible, especially when this Ecclesiastick Monarch exercised this Spiritual Censure only to serve a base, sordid, secular End. This created the Pontificate many and powerful Enemies; the most formidable and fatal of which to this Time was *Lewis* of *Bavaria*, the Emperor; who having often and in vain solliciteed a Reconciliation with the See of *Rome*, in a general Convention of Princes at *Frankfort*, (where our King *Edward* III. was present) declares the Pope to have nothing to do in the Election of the Emperor, *&c.* at the same Time drawing the Pens of the most Learned Men of the Age in his Quarrel, who soon instructed Princes how to repel the thundering *Anathema's* of the Court of *Rome*.

The last publick Act of Pope *Clement* VI. was his buying the City of *Avignon* of *Joan* Queen of *Naples* and *Sicily*; but whether he thought he had a hard Bargain of her, or what else was the Occasion, I shall not pretend to judge, he soon after excommunicated Queen *Joan*.

[1352.] *Innocent* VI. before call'd *Stephen*, a *French*-man, succeeds; who copies after his Prede-

ceſſors in maintaining the uſurp'd Rights of the Pontificate over the Regale: For when the Emperor *Charles* IV. enter'd *Italy*, he would not permit him to be crown'd at *Rome*, but upon theſe Conditions, *viz.* To enter the City on Foot; to take an Oath to leave *Italy* forthwith, and not to return till he was ſent for by the Pope. The cunning Emperor accepts the Conditions, and took the Oath, ſubmitting the Imperial Majeſty to his Holineſs's Ambition: Which procured him a long Reign; for at that Time, and after, he was oppos'd by no leſs than Three Candidates, and who were ſucceſſively choſen; and therefore he was obliged to comply with what Conditions the Pope ſhould impoſe on him, though never ſo unreaſonable; for his Holineſs's Weight on either Side would very advantagiously have turn'd the Scale. Though his Reign held Ten Years, yet there is little ſaid of him, or tranſacted by him, but one Council being call'd during his whole Pontificate.

About the Year 1360, which was toward the End of Pope *Innocent* VI.'s Pontificate, the famous *John Wickliff* flourished; a moſt excellent Philoſopher and compleat Divine, and no leſs eminent for his holy Life and moral Virtues, than Learning. He was a ſtrenuous Oppoſer of thoſe ſuperſtitious Errors, which for a long Time, like poiſonous Weeds, had ſprung up in the Church, and ſuppreſs'd the true primitive Doctrines; and an able and valiant Champion in Defence of the Rights of the Church and Crown, againſt the exorbitant Encroachments and Uſurpations of the *Roman* Pontiff and his Mendicant Brethren: For the Pride and Arrogance of the Court of *Rome* was arrived to that Height, that they received at leaſt half the Revenues of the Kingdom: And in Eccleſiaſtick Affairs the Friars Mendicants grew ſo impudent and importunate, that they rambled about the Nation at Pleaſure, intruding into Parihes without

out Controul, and paying no Subjection or Acknowledgment to Episcopal Jurisdiction and Canons of the Church. These Extravagancies, *Wicklef*, both from the Pulpit and with his Pen, couragiously and successfully attacks, delivering the Doctrines of the Christian Faith in their naked and natural Simplicity, and preaching and expounding the Sacred Oracles of the Scripture in the Mother-Tongue. This, as it drew on him the Envy of the Bad, procured him a great Esteem among the Good; and so endear'd him to King *Edward* III. and *Richard* II. that one employ'd him as his Ambassador Abroad, and the other chose him his Confessor at home; and his Authority and Interest were so prevalent with the great Men of the Kingdom, that there were more and severer Laws made against the Usurpations of *Rome*, and the Exorbitances of the Mendicants, in the Reigns of these Two Kings, than from the Time of *William* the *Norman* to the throwing off the *Roman* Yoke under *Henry* VIII. The Editors, in the Life of *Innocent* VI. *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1230. call him Arch-heretick; and say, that being put by the Bishoprick of *Worcester*, in Revenge he broach'd his Doctrines; but it plainly appear'd the utmost of his Ambition and Endeavours was to set the Doctrines of the Church in a true Light, and to extricate the Christian Faith out of that Labyrinth of Errors and Superstition it had for many Ages been involved in. The several Bishops of *Rome* that liv'd during his Time plainly perceiv'd their Cause sinking in *England*, and the Mendicants began to deplore the Discovery of their Knavery; wherefore, to support their tottering Interest, they begin to bestir themselves on all Sides to silence and ruine *Wicklef*. The First Attempt upon him was by the Power of Archbishop *Langham*, who in the Year 1367. removed him from the Mastership of *Merton* College, together with the Fellows; who appeal to Pope *Urban*

ban V. and the Matter being by him left to the Determination of Cardinal *Andruyn*, their Deprivation is by him confirmed, and afterwards ratified by the Pope's Bull *A. D.* 1370. Toward the End of King *Edward* III.'s Reign, (who was now worn out with Age, and become almost delirious) *Simon Sudbury*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, calls a Synod at *London*, where *Wichlef* is summoned to give an Account of his Doctrine; but *John* Duke of *Lancaster*, and several of the Nobility, standing fast to his Interest, he came off untouch'd; as he did likewise in another Synod at *Lambeth*: But after the Death of King *Edward* III. when the Kingdom began to be disturb'd, and *John* Duke of *Lancaster* retired from Court, the Bishops, by repeated Letters from Pope *Gregory* XI. began to move again; and having gain'd King *Richard* II. (a Prince too apt to be led away) into their Interest, in a Synod at *London*, *A. D.* 1382. they condemn'd *Wicklef*, his Doctrine, and Followers; but notwithstanding this Sentence of the Synod, he remain'd at his Parish of *Lutterworth* in *Leicestershire*, where to his dying Hour he continued firm to his Principles, which he maintain'd both by Preaching and Writing.

[1362.] *William Grisant*, another *Frenchman*, by the Name of *Urban* V. succeeds; and, in Imitation of his Predecessors, to shew his Power in Secular Affairs, in the Beginning of his Pontificate, thunders out his *Anathema's*. The First of which fell on Count *Bernabas* of *Milain*; next on *Peter* King of *Castile*, whom he not only excommunicates, but (*More Romano*) commands to be expell'd his Kingdom; and, to add to the Infamy of these Proceedings, orders his natural Brother *Henry* to be legitimated, and put in *Peter*'s Room. Soon after, upon a very slight Occasion, he quarrels with *Peter* King of *Arragon*, whom he excommunicates, and deprives of the Kingdoms of *Corsica* and *Sardinia*. *A. D.* 1367. he goes to *Rome*, where,

where, having settled Affairs according to his Mind, he triumphs in Security. *A. D.* 1378. he received the Emperor *Charles* at *Rome*, having first made him (to shew his Humility) perform the Office of Groom of the Stirrop. The Year following he dignifies *John Paleologus* Emperor of *Constantinople* with the same Office, having first invited him to *Rome*, in Hopes of gaining Assistance against the *Turks*; whom, after he had sworn Obedience to him, he dismiss'd. The same Year he return'd to *Avignon*, where in *December* he quitted this World, to receive in the next the Reward of his Charity, Meekness and Humility, to crown'd Heads.

In the Eighth Year of *Urban* V. a Council was held at *La Vaur*, by the Bishops of the Three Provinces of *Narbonne*, *Toulouse*, and *Aquitain*, but by the Special Direction of the Pope; as appears from his Epistles to *Peter* Bishop of *Narbonne*, *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1957, 1958. where, among the 133 Canons, near half are but old ones reviv'd, and in them several gross superstitious Errors; particularly in the first, which is very long, and contains an Exposition of the Doctrine of Faith, according to the Apostolick, Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds. In the Exposition of the Seven Sacraments, *viz.* Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Pennance, Extream Unction, Orders, and Marriage, they say on the Article of Baptism, *The Priest in this Sacrament is the Minister, or any other in case of Necessity.* Ibid. p. 198. Insisting on the old Error of Lay Baptism, which we have already noted in the Fourth Council of *Carthage*, in the Time of Pope *Anastasius* I. *A. D.* 398. In the Exposition on the Ten Commandments, they observe the same Method, in leaving out the Second, and dividing the Tenth into Two, to supply the Number; as was begun by Pope *Hadrian* I. *ad An.* 772. *& seq.*

[1370.] Car-

[1370.] Cardinal *Belfort*, by the Name of *Gregory* XI. succeeds Pope *Urban* V. of whom there is little said by the Editors, or any other Author. The First remarkable Act was his Excommunicating *Joan* Queen of *Naples*; whom, notwithstanding this was not the first Time she had lain under the heavy Censure of the Supream Pontiff, *Cabbasutius* defends, and mentions with Compassion, *Eccles. Notit. p.* 500. *A. D.* 1376. he issues out a most thundering *Anathema* against the *Florentines*; who treat his Holiness with the utmost Contempt, compelling the Clergy, upon Pain of Death, to perform Divine Service. But the most remarkable Passage of his Life was the Year following, when he restor'd the Holy See from *Avignon* to *Rome*. The Occasion of this is variously related by several Authors; but the Editors in this Pope's Life take *Platina*'s Account before others, which indeed looks most plausible, and is thus: "A certain "Bishop being reprov'd by the Pope for Non-resi-"dence, readily and briskly replied, And why do "you, who are the Head of the Universal Church, "and of all Bishops, absent from your own Church? "His Holiness stung with so just a Reproach, imme-"diately prepares to return. *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. "*p.* 2306, 2307.

[1378.] From the Time of the Translation of the Pontifical See from *Rome* to *Avignon*, there had sate Seven Popes in it, *viz. Clement* V. *John* XXII. *Benedict* XII. *Clement* VI. *Innocent* VI. and *Gregory* IX. who restor'd it to *Rome*, *A. D.* 1377. where the Year after he died. Upon whose Death follow'd a dreadful Schism, which continued Fifty Years. The Editors and *Cabbasutius* differ very widely about the Election of Pope *Gregory* IX.'s Successor. They, *Con. Tom.* XI. *par.* 2. *p.* 2044. say, That *Bartholomew* of *Naples*, and Archbishop of *Veria*, was by the common Consent of the Cardinals living at *Rome*, without any

Compulsion or Fear of the *Roman* People, chosen Pope, who afterwards took upon him the Name of *Urban* VI. *Cabbasutius* says quite the contrary, who tells us, *Eccles. Notit. p.* 500. *col.* 1. " That when the " Cardinals were enter'd the Conclave, to consider " on the Choice of a new Pope, the People of *Rome* " being jealous, that upon the Choice of a *French*-" man the Pontifical See would be again remov'd " from *Rome*, forcibly enter'd the Conclave, threat-" ning the Cardinals with Death if they did " not forthwith choose an *Italian* Pope. In this " Fright they chose *Bartholomew* Archbishop of *Ve-* " *ria*, who was very busy among the regionary Go-" vernors, and had insinuated himself among the " Mob at that Time." They likewise differ in the Occasion and commencing of the Schism; for the Editors say, *ibid.* That Pope *Urban* VI. in the Beginning of his Pontificate, taking upon him to correct the Loosenes of Morals among the Cardinals, they not submitting to his Correction, he withdraws from *Rome* to *Anagnania*; and whilst he was absent, they chose another Pope in his Room. But this does not carry a Face of Truth with it; and *Cabbasutius*, *ibid.* seems to have more Truth, or, at least, Plausibility, on his Side; for he says, " *Joan* Queen of *Naples* had " shewn her self very kind to Pope *Urban* in the Be-" ginning of his Pontificate, furnishing him with " Money, Guards, Provisions, *&c.* who (good Man) " in Return, conspires with her Uncle *Charles* Prince " of *Dyrrachium* to deprive her of her Kingdom: " Whereupon she quits the faithless ungrateful Man, " and sides with the Schism against him." But be it how it will, it's most certain that the Cardinals in the *French* Interest were the major Part of the Conclave, and therefore, retiring from *Rome*, they met at *Fondi*, where they chose *Robert* Count of *Gebenne* Pope; a Man, (says *Cabbasutius*) eminent for his proper Merits,

rits, as well as illustrious for the Greatness of his Extraction, and crown'd him with the Pontifical Crown, which they brought from *Rome*, he taking upon him the Name of *Clement* VII. Which was the real Occasion of the Schism, and of those terrible Convulsions which shook great Part of *Europe* for many Years. These Two Chiefs prepare with both Spiritual and Temporal Arms to attack each other, drawing several Nations into their Interest, Pope *Urban* sets up the See at *Rome*, *Italy*, *Germany*, and *Hungary*, declaring for him; whilst *France*, *Spain*, and the rest of the Western Church, acknowledge *Clement* at *Avignon*. Pope *Urban*, in Imitation of his Predecessors, to be reveng'd of *Joan* Queen of *Naples* for siding with the Scismaticks against him, calls in *Charles* Prince of *Dyrrachium* to dethrone her, which he accomplishes by the Help of the good Pope, who was not wanting in supplying the Prince with Men and Money, and poor Queen *Joan* (to use *Cabbasute*'s own Words, *ibid. p.* 500. *col.* 2.) ABDICATES, and her Nephew *Charles* plac'd in her Room. Pope *Urban* having thus successfully reveng'd himself of Queen *Joan*, and obliged Prince *Charles*, makes no Scruple of gaining any Point; and therefore he demands of him to create his Nephew Prince of *Capua*. But notwithstanding all former Obligations, Prince *Charles* proves just such another Ingrate as his Holiness, and refuses his Demand; upon which Disappointment he retires to *Nuceria*, where in a very solemn Manner he deposes Prince *Charles*; who briskly returns his Compliment, and besieges his Holiness, who is relieved by Count *Raymund*: And returning from *Nuceria*, through *Genoa*, he executes Seven Cardinals that conspired against him. Upon the Death of *Charles*, he intended to go to *Naples*, to deprive his Children of the Kingdom, but Death prevented him. His whole Life was, in short, one continued Series of Trouble,

being

being ſeveral Times taken Priſoner, and always expos'd to Danger.

In the Beginning of this Schiſm there was a Council called at *Complutum*, (now called *Alcala de Henares*) by the Biſhops of *Spain*, wherein *Peter Tenorius*, Archbiſhop of *Toledo*, preſided. At which Time, *Urban* poſſeſſing the See at *Rome*, and *Clement* at *Avignon*, and both claiming the Title of true and lawful Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, it was debated by the Fathers of this Council, whom they ſhould declare for; but they came to no Reſolution. This was *A. D.* 1379. In which Year, and upon the ſame Occaſion, there was a Convention of Biſhops at *d'Illeſcas*, and another at *Toledo*, where the ſame Archbiſhop preſided. Likewiſe another at *Burgos*, and the Year following another at *Medina Campeſtris*; in all which nothing was determin'd about the Queſtion in Hand; and though Legates from both were employ'd to urge them to a Reſolution, whom they would own, they warily decreed to refer the Matter to the Determination of a General Council. But in the Year 1381, a Council was held at *Salamanca*, where *Peter de Luna*, Cardinal-Legate of *Clement* VII. preſided, in which *Urban* is rejected, and *Clement* acknowledg'd for Pope. The ſame Thing was done, *A. D.* 1387. in a Convention of the Biſhops and Nobility of *Navar*, and in another at *Barcelona*; by which Means *Clement* carried his Point throughout *Spain*. This Council of *Complutum* is not mentioned by the Editors, but is to be ſeen at large in Cardinal *d'Aguirr's Conc. Hiſpan. Tom.* 3. p. 618, 619, 620.

[1389.] Upon the Death of *Urban* VI. *Boniface* IX. before called *Peter Thomacell*, is elected and conſecrated Biſhop of *Rome*. In the Thirty fourth, or, as ſome ſay, in the Forty fifth Year of his Age. In the firſt Year of his Pontificate he took off the Anathema which his Predeceſſor *Urban* had laid on *Charles* King

King of *Sicily* and his Posterity. The Editors, *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 2077, quarrel with *Theodoricus a Niem*, and say, That he unjustly charges the Sovereign Pontiff with Simony and Avarice; and that they give two of the greatest Instances of his insatiable Thirst of Wealth: For in his Second Year he lays that heavy Burden of First-Fruits on the Church, obliging every one to pay the Value of the first Year's Profits of all Ecclesiastick Benefits into the Apostolick Treasury. In the Year 1394, the *Romans* were fatally sensible of the Power his Holiness had gain'd by this Tax, for having quieted the tumultuous Seditions between the Nobility and Populace, (of which he cannot escape being thought the Fomenter) he fortifies the Castle of St. *Angelo*, stores it with warlike Ammunition, disposes of the Magistracy, and levies Taxes at Pleasure; insomuch that *Bzovius*, *ad An.* 1394. *n.* 1. says, *He was the first of all the* Roman *Pontiffs that took all Power from the People of* Rome, *and invested the Sovereignty of the City in himself.* But how favourably soever the Editors may speak of Pope *Boniface*, yet at the End of his Life, they say, he was too indulgent to his Relations, for which he deserv'd a little Reprehension.

[1394.] The Editors and *Cabbasute* leave out *Benedict* XIII. by which they make a Vacancy of above Ten Years; for *Boniface* IX. dying *A. D.* 1394, and *Innocent* VII. not being chosen till *A. D.* 1404, there must of Course be such a Vacancy; or else they must admit of *Benedict* XIII. which it's plain they do not. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 2083. and yet they say nothing of a Vacancy before *Innocent* VII. was elected; only that he was chosen in the Reign of *Robert* the Emperor; upon Condition that, to put an End to the Schism, he should at any Time resign the Papacy. For, continue the Editors, *ibid.* all the Cardinals before the Election, in the Presence of

Go.

Gobeline and *Theodoric*, had solemnly oblig'd themselves by Oath, Whosoever of them should be chosen Pope, if need required, to restore the Unity of the Church, he should resign, provided that *Peter de Luna*, who called himself *Benedict* XIII. would do the same. "*Innocent* stands to his Word, say they, and accordingly called a General Council at *Rome*; but the "*Gibelline* Faction prevailing there, none of the Bishops summon'd could with Safety appear. For "*Innocent* having, soon after his Election, restor'd the "Government of the City to the Senate, they grew "so insolent as to demand all Fortifications, *&c.* relating thereto, to be delivered to them; and calling in *Ladislaus* King of *Naples*, they took up "Arms. But *Ladislaus* being defeated by *Ursinus*, "*Innocent* comes to *Rome* again, from whence he had "upon the foresaid Tumults retir'd, where he soon "after dy'd." The Attempts that were made by some for healing the Schism, seem very sincere, especially those of *Innocent* VII. but those of *Gregory* XII. his Successor, and *Benedict* XIII. prov'd very unfair and shuffling; for they seldom stood to any Thing they proposed. This *Benedict* XIII. was that very *Peter de Luna*, whom we have had Occasion to mention a little before, being a Creature of *Clement* VII. and, as Cardinal Legate from him, presided in the Council of *Salamanca*, *A. D.* 1381, wherein *Urban* VI. was rejected, and *Clement* VII. acknowledg'd Pope; upon whose Death he was chosen Pope at *Avignon*, and with great Cunning and Obstinacy held the Pontificate till the Year 1423. He was consecrated and crown'd conditionally, taking an Oath to resign, if *Boniface* IX. would do the same, to put an End to the Schism. Amongst all the Princes that proposed the Restauration of the Peace and Unity of the Church, by putting an End to this unhappy Schism, none were so forward in promoting it as *Charles* VI. King of *France*,

France, notwithstanding the Papal See was held at *Avignon*. In order to this, in the Year 1394, by his own Authority, he calls a Council of Archbishops and Bishops at *Paris*, at which were present several of the King's Counsellors, and the Chancellor of *France*; and *Simon Cramandi*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and Administrator of the Church of *Carcassone*, was by a general Consent chosen President. Besides the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Deans, *&c.* there were summon'd the most learned Professors of Theology and the Laws, to advise with about a Reconciliation; where every one upon Oath obliges himself freely to offer what he shall think most expedient, to procure an Union. Of the Three Methods proposed, *viz.* by a General Council, by Compromise or Award, and by Cession, the last seem'd the most plausible; to which the Fathers unanimously agree, and then deliberate upon the Manner of obtaining this Cession from either Party. Upon the same Account there was another Council called at *Paris* the next Year; but in the Year 1398, there was a Third Council called there; in which it was unanimously resolv'd, That *Cession* was the only Remedy; and the *Subtractory Decree* was publish'd, by which *Benedict* was to be depriv'd of all Money, Subsidy, Provisions, Benefices, and all Sort of Emolument, till he consented to the Cession proposed. *Spondan. Annal. ad An.* 1398. *n.* 5, 6, *& seq.* After this, to the Year 1398, he was importunately sollicited by many Christian Princes and Bishops, to restore Peace to the Church; but all in vain, for he is continually inventing some Subterfuge or Evasion to elude them, that he might preserve the Pontificate to himself. But at last *Charles* VI. being tired with his insincere Dealing, resolves to compel him by Force; and therefore besieges him in *Avignon*, takes him Prisoner, and continues him in Custody till the Year 1403, when the

cunning Fox makes his Escape, and flies to his old Arts of dissembling, declaring he was always ready to resign, to put an End to this flagrant Schism, tho' he left no Arts unattempted to maintain himself in the Papacy.

[1406.] Nor was his Competitor *Gregory* XII. before called *Angelus Coriarius*, behind-hand with him in the same Methods; and tho' both, in their Epistles to each other, seem ready to sacrifice themselves for the Peace of the Church. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 2085, *& seq.* yet it's plain from their Practices, they never intended any such Thing. In short, the two *Good Men* never mean what they say; but use all the Artifice imaginable to cheat each other, and impose upon the World: Which soon open'd the Eyes of all, especially the Cardinals on both Sides, who were resolv'd to be trick'd no longer, and therefore called a General Council at *Pisa*. The Editors in the Life of Pope *Gregory* XII. own a Council was called at *Pisa*, and that the two contending Pontiffs were by it deposed; but they do not say it was called by the Conclave or College of Cardinals; and tho' it is own'd to be called by them, even by *Cabbasutius* himself, (as we shall presently shew) yet in the Title of it the Editors will not own it, but say, *The General* Pisan *Council, called to put an End to the Schism, by deposing the contending Popes* Gregory *and* Benedict, *and held under* Alexander V. *chosen by the Consent of the Cardinals of each Party. Con. T.* 11. *ib.* 2114. Now these two Popes being under the Censure of each opposite Party, are by them called to account for keeping up a Schism, and to be put off no longer by Promises, they, tho' these Popes were at that Time both undeposed, by Vertue of their own Authority call a Council, and that a General one too. Where then is the mighty Topick so much boasted of, and insisted on by the Friends of the Pontificate, *That none but the*

Bishop of Rome *can call a General Council*; or that other, *That the Bishop of* Rome *is above the Censure of a Council?* I shall not need to descant further on these Points, the Facts prove themselves; which nothing more illustrates than the Acts of this *Pisan* Council, and further Accounts which *Cabbasutius* and others nakedly and plainly relate from them. Nay, though both *Gregory* and *Benedict*, in Answer to their Summons to appear at this Council, tell the Cardinals, That they had no Right to call a Council, that being their Province only, yet they take no Notice of it, but proceed against them both, constituting *Guido de Malesico*, Cardinal Bishop of *Preneste*, President of the Council, who as such subscrib'd first. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 2213. tho' for some Part of the Time of this Council, which was in the 20th Session, Pope *Alexander* V. presided. But however irregular Pope *Gregory* or *Benedict* might think the Calling it, and Proceedings in this Council, it's certain they had the Pontifical Approbation and Sanction; for the Editors, *ibid. p.* 2325, in the Life of Pope *Alexander* V. tell us, *Omnia quæ in Concilio Pisano decreta erant, sibi justa videri dixit. He said, all Things that were determin'd in the* Pisan *Council seem'd just to him.* And in this Pope's Praise, no Body is so extravagant as *Cabbasutius*, *p.* 521. tho' the Editors say enough of him; so that they must not complain of hard Usage or Encroachment on the Pontifical Rights, when they receive their Sanction from a supream Pontiff. But the Council of *Pisa* being called chiefly to put an End to the Schism, it will not be improper to give a summary Account of it. This Council was called by the Cardinals of both Parties on the 25th of *March*, 1409. to put an End to the Schism. At which, besides the Ambassadors of several Kings and Sovereign Princes, there were present 180 Archbishops and Bishops, 300 Abbots, 120 Professors of Divinity, 300 Doctors of

Laws.

Laws. In the first Session, after the Formalities of opening a Council were over, two Cardinal Deacons, two Archbishops, two Bishops, with several Doctors and Notaries, by the Command of the Council, went to the Doors of the Church, where making Proclamation, they demand whither *Peter de Luna* and *Angelus de Coriario*, called *Benedict* and *Gregory*, were there present, or any Body for them; and none appearing, they were recorded guilty of Contumacy. The Third Session the Decree of Contumacy was publish'd against the contending Popes for not obeying a lawful Summons; and the Cardinals that adher'd to their Interest are summon'd to the Council. The Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Sessions, the Articles against the Competitors were publickly read, and prov'd by sufficient Witnesses, and declar'd by the Synod, to be manifestly plain. The Fifteenth Session the definitive Sentence was publickly read, approv'd, and subscrib'd by the Council; by Vertue of which *Peter de Luna*, and *Angelus de Coriario*, as guilty of *Schism*, *Heresy*, *Perjury*, *and Contumacy*, *are canonically deposed*, *and cut off from the Church*, *and all the Faithful are absolved from all Manner of Obedience to them*, *and all Censures and Sentences publish'd by either of them for the Space of a Year before are declared void.* The Ninteenth Session the Cardinals proceed to the Election of a new Pope, entring the Conclave the 15th of *June*, to which likewise were admitted those Cardinals who were created by the contending Popes during the Schism, by a peculiar Indulgence granted by the Synod on this Occasion; accordingly on the 26th of *June* they chose

[1409.] *Peter* of *Candia*, Cardinal Archbishop of *Milan*, who, upon his being proclaimed Pope, took upon him the Name of *Alexander* V. The Twentieth Session, which was on the first of *July*, Pope *Alexander* V. presides in the Council; confirms all the

Proceedings and Decrees of the Cardinals from the 3d of *May* 1408, unites the two Factions of the Cardinals, grants several Privileges to those that were present at the Council, and began a general Reformation, which he soon drop'd, his Pontificate not continuing a Year. The Twenty first, second and third Sessions, all Processes from the Time of the Schism are abolish'd, Censures rescinded, Promotions, Consecrations and Ordinations regularly perform'd, ratified; all that adher'd to *Peter de Luna* and *Angelus de Coriario*, lately condemn'd of Schism and Heresy, to be judg'd as Favourers of Heresy: That within three Years a General Council be held, and that in the mean time Provincial Councils be assembled in order to carry on the Business of Reformation.

Upon the Election of Pope *Alexander* V. Pope *Benedict* XIII. retires into *Catalonia*, and Pope *Gregory* XII to *Rimini*; where they both create Cardinals, and in Council condemn each his Rival and their Followers, and rescind all their Acts. *Bellarmine*, in his first Book, *de Concil. &. Eccles. c.* 8. did ill consider the Supremacy of the Pontificate, (of which he is so strenuous a Champion) where he says, *Ferme communem esse Opinionem, Alexandrum* V. *& qui ei successit, Joannem* XXIII. *fuisse veros Pontifices: Et ex tribus qui tum se pro Pontificibus gerebant, istos maximè ut veros Pontifices cultos. It was the received Opinion, that* Alexander V. *and* John XXIII. *who succeeded him, were true Popes; and that of the Three who claimed the Papacy, they were acknowledg'd as such. Richer. l.* 2. *c.* 6. *p.* 71. For it is undeniably plain from all their own Authorities, that *Alexander* V. was chosen Pope by the *Pisan* Council, which was called by the Cardinals, without the Consent of either of the contending Popes: Which plainly determines against a Pope's being above the Censure of a Council.

[1410.] Pope

[1410.] Pope *Alexander* V. being removed out of the Way by Poison, makes Way for his hopeful Successor, *John* XXIII. a Complication of all Manner of Villany: Who, partly by Bribes, partly by Force of Arms, terrifies the Majority of the Conclave to declare him Pope, which they accordingly do. He enters upon the Pontificate like many of his Predecessors, thundring out his Anathema's against several, particularly *Ladislaus* King of *Naples*. But in a short Time his Enormities grow so conspicuous, and he so odious, that *Sigismund* the Emperor insisting on that Decree of the *Pisan* Council, which obliges the Bishops of the Church to hold a General Council once in three Years; Pope *John*, at his Instance, is forc'd to call a General Council to be held at *Constance*, and promise, that he would resign the Pontificate, if *Benedict* and *Gregory* the Antipopes would do the same. Accordingly, in *November*, *A. D.* 1414. he arriv'd at *Constance*, and began the Council, at which were present, besides Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Doctors of Divinity and of Laws, the Emperor *Sigismund*, who was very zealous for the Peace of the Church, and several Princes of *Germany* and *Hungary*. The Council being met, after the usual Formalities of opening it, the Fathers begin with the State of the Church, now involv'd in a triple Schism, there being no less than Three who claim'd the Papal Chair. To extinguish therefore this monstrous and flagrant Division, they began with Pope *John*, whom they ply with such pressing Importunities, that at last he reads the Form of Resignation in most solemn Manner, kneeling towards the Altar, and with his Right Hand on his Breast, (says *Cabbasutius*, *p.* 523. *col.* 1.) he sware to resign the Pontificate, provided *Benedict* and *Gregory* would do the like. But notwithstanding these solemn Professions, it's plain he intended not to perform them; for being conscious of

what he deserv'd, and apprehensive of approaching Judgment, he privately and in Disguise by Night withdraws from *Constance* to *Schaffusia*, a Town belonging to *Frideric* Duke of *Austria*, with whom before he had concerted his Escape. The News of this surprizes the Fathers, whom the Emperor comforts, and encourages to proceed, and assures them of his Protection. This was the Proceeding of the First and Second Sessions. And here it will be of Use to observe the Disposition of Affairs in this Council, as *Cabbasutius* and *Caranza* represent them; not to mention *Binius*, *Longus a Coriolano*, and other Parasites of the Court of *Rome*, and Friends of the Pontificate. The Fourth and Fifth Sessions of this Council plainly and positively disallow the supreme Power of the Bishop of *Rome*, by subjecting him to the Censure of a General Council. *Con. T.* 12. *p* 19, 22. decreeing, "That the Council duly called, and representing the "Catholick Church, has its immediate Power from "Christ, which all Persons, even the Papal Dignity, "are bound to obey in Things pertaining to Faith, "the Extirpation of the present Schism, and the Re-"formation of the Church both in Head and Mem-"bers: Decreeing moreover, that the present Pope "*John* XXIII. shall resign the Papacy, and stand to "the Determination of the Council; that his Retreat "from the Council is unlawful; and, unless he will "return, they will proceed against him as a Here-"tick and Schismatick; At the same Time making "void all Acts perform'd by him without the Con-"sent of the Council, *&c.* That these were the Acts of this Council, *Caranza*, *p.* 826, 827. and *Cabbasutius*, *p.* 526. *col.* 2. allow; which both would seem to take off, drawing their Argument from Cardinal *Turrecremata*, *Sanders*, and others. "In these "Circumstances (aforesaid), *viz.* of Schism, *&c.* "says *Cabbasutius*, *ibid.* the Decree of the Council of

"Con-

" *Constance* was right; for all Divines and Canonists unanimously agree, that a Pope is subject to, " and ought to obey the Authority of a General " Council, in these two Events: 1. When a Pope " shall prove a manifest obstinate Heretick: For he " ceases to be Pope when he is without the Church, " and consequently ceases to be either Head or Member of the Mystical Body. 2. When there are " more Popes than one created; so that it cannot " be known which is the true one, and which the " false; which to be receiv'd, and which to be re- " jected; as it happen'd in this Dispute about Three " Popes. For then it highly concern'd the Government of the Church, and the Salvation of Souls, " to have a certain Pope, and to put an End to this " dangerous Schism. And this was the true Case of " the Two General Councils of *Pisa* and *Constance*. I grant this to be the Case of these Two Councils, but cannot allow the Inference that they make from it, *viz.* That the Power of a Council is not absolutely definitive, but casually, as in Time of Schism; for this Proof is grounded upon nothing but Forgeries. *Cabbassutius*, p 527. says, " That the Holy Bishop and " Martyr *Boniface* affirms, no Mortal can call a Pope " to Account, because he, who has Power to judge " all Men, can be judged of none, unless he be " proved a Heretick." And this, he says, was de- " termined in ancient Councils, particularly those of *Sinuessa* and *Rome* under Pope *Symmachus*. As for the Council of *Sinuessa*, it is a most palpable Forgery, as has been already shewn in the Papacy of *Marcellinus*, l. D. 296. And as to the *Roman* Council under Pope *Symmachus*, it is the most unlucky Citation that could be stumbled on. For *Symmachus* was so far from being exempted from, not only Ecclesiastick but Civil Judgment, that the Case between him and *Laurence* the Antipope was referr'd to *Theodorick*

King of the *Goths*, who declared in Favour of him that had the most Votes, and was first consecrated. The same likewise, *A. D.* 502, was again refer'd to *Theodoric*, who deputing *Peter Altinas* to determine it, it was given against *Symmachus*, and he was dispossess'd, but afterwards restored. *Vid. Supra, ad An.* 498. But *Cabbasutius* goes on with his forg'd Authority, *ibid.* "No General Council, says he, can be regularly "called, without the Authority of the supreme Pon-"tiff, as Pope *Marcellus* I. affirms in his Epistle to "the Bishops of the Province of *Antioch*, and Pope "*Julius* I. in his Epistle to the Oriental Bishops; "which *Athanasius* mentions in his *Apologet.* 2. where-"in he blames them for holding a Council at *An-"tioch* without his Consent. These Two are as notorious Forgeries as the former: For as to Pope *Marcellus*, it is much to be questioned whether there ever was such a Man in Being; and as to the Epistle to the Bishops of *Antioch*, *Bellarmine* himself will not affirm it for genuine. *Vid. supra, ad An.* 30. But as to the Epistle of Pope *Julius* I. to the Eastern Bishops in Behalf of *Athanasius*, *Cabbasutius* did ill consult Antiquity to produce Authority from so scandalous a Fiction to support the Supremacy; so this Sham-Epistle is quite different from the genuine Epistle of *Julius*, which is to be found in *Athanasius*'s *Apologet.* 2. Besides, *Baronius* condemns it for a Forgery. *Vid. supra, ad An.* 336. But to take off this Cramp of Power which these two Sessions of the Council of *Constance* seem to have upon the Papal Supremacy, *Cabbasutius*, *p.* 526. *col.* 2. tells us, that Pope *Martin* V. before the Dissolution of the Council, being ask'd about the Confirmation of its Decrees, eply'd, "That he would inviolably keep and observ all the "Decrees of the Council which were determin'd, "by Way of Council, in Matters of Faith and no "other Way. From whence *Cabbasutius* serves,

"that

" that Pope *Martin* would not allow of the Decree " of Seſſion IV. of the Council of *Conſtance*, becauſe " it gave them a Power above the Pope, and ſub- " jected him to Puniſhment." But he muſt here miſtake Pope *Martin*'s Meaning, for tho' the Pope ſays, he will confirm no Decrees in Matters of Faith, but what were determin'd in a Synodical Way; yet he does not diſallow any other Decrees of that Council; for the Fourth and Fifth Seſſions of this Council, which he ſtrikes at, were in Favour of him that was to ſucceed Pope *John* XXIII. which prov'd to be himſelf; for the ſame Power that remov'd Pope *John*, and renounc'd *Benedict* and *Gregory*, made him Pope, which was in Seſſion XLI. And as to his trifling Aſſertion, *That a General Council cannot regularly be called without the Authority of the* Roman *Pontiff*; I would fain know, Who but the Cardinals of the two contending Popes, *Benedict* and *Gregory*, called the General Council of *Piſa*, that depoſed both, and choſe *Alexander* V.? But this the ſubſequent Seſſions of this Council more fully explain; and at which this very Pope *Martin* V. in the Quality of Cardinal Deacon, was preſent.

Seſſ. XII. *May* 29. Pope *John* XXIII. having been often ſummon'd to the Council, and offer'd ſafe Conduct, but not obeying, is declar'd guilty of Contumacy, that his withdrawing from the Council was ſcandalous, and diſturbing the Peace and Unity of the Church, fomenting the Schiſm, and contrary to the Promiſe and Oath which he had made to the Church and this Council: That he the ſaid *John* was a notorious Simoniac, and an Embezeller, not only of the Goods and Rights of the Church of *Rome*, but of ſeveral other Churches and Holy Places: That he was an unfaithful Adminiſtrator and Steward of the Affairs Spiritual and Temporal of the Church: That he had notoriouſly ſcandaliz'd the People of Chriſt by his wicked

wicked Life and deteſtable Morals, both before and after his Promotion to the Papal Dignity, even to this very Time. And by his obſtinate and arrogant perſevering in his foreſaid Crimes, and other Things laid to his Charge, *We declare him, as unworthy, uſeleſs and pernicious, to be deprived of all Spiritual and Temporal Adminiſtration, and to be depoſed, and abſolve all Chriſtians whatſoever from all Manner of Obedience, Fidelity, and Oath to him, &c.* To which definitive Sentence was added, That, for the future, none of the contending Popes ſhould ever hereafter be choſen again into the Pontifical Chair. All which was ratified by Pope *John* himſelf, and the Decree being confirm'd, he reſign'd the Pontificate. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 95, 96, 97. He was afterwards committed to the Cuſtody of *Lewis* Duke of *Bavaria*, by whom he was impriſon'd three Years at *Heidelberg*; from whence being enlarg'd, he died at *Florence*, *A. D.* 1418. This was one great Step towards putting an End to the Schiſm, which is immediately ſucceeded by another; for in the Fourteenth Seſſion *Gregory* XII. finding himſelf deſerted and deſpiſed, conſtitutes *Charles Malateſta*, Prince of *Ariminum*, where he reſided, his Proctor, who in *Gregory*'s Name reſigns the Pontificate; upon which the Cardinals created by him were received and acknowledg'd by the Synod, and both Intereſts united. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 103. *& in Append.* In the Sixteenth Seſſion, to put an End to the Schiſm on all Sides, the Synod appoint Legates to *Benedict* XIII. to perſuade him to a Seſſion, but in vain; the old Fox trifles with them, and puts them off with nothing but Delays: Which ſo exaſperates *Ferdinand* King of *Arragon*, and other Princes, that they deſert his Intereſt, and forbid their Subjects to acknowledge him any longer as Pope. *Benedict*, no Way diſheartned with theſe Miſfortunes, obſtinately perſiſts in his Claim, affirming himſelf to be the only lawful Pontiff of the Uni-

Universal Church, and that he was resolv'd to maintain his Right and Dignity to the last; and retiring with what Friends he could engage, he fortifies himself in *Peniscola* on the Coast of *Valencia*, where he excommunicates all Kings and Princes that had receded from their Obedience to him, and depose them of their Titles. *Gabbasut. p.* 525. *col.* 1. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 1812. where in the Year 1423 he died. But before this, in the Thirty seventh Session of this Council of *Constance*, the Fathers finding him inflexible, proceed to a definitive Sentence against, and as a perjur'd Person, Scandalizer of the Universal Church, a Favourer and Cherisher of Schism, a Disturber of the Peace and Unity of the Church, Schismatick, Heretick, *&c.* unworthy of all Title, Honour or Degree, they deprive him of the Papal Dignity, *&c. Con. T.* 12. *p.* 235.

The Fathers of this Council having in the subsequent Sessions, after the Deposition of the foresaid Popes, resolv'd upon calling a General Council Five Years after the Dissolution of this, another after Seven Years, and after that one every Ten Years, and having prepar'd a Form or Profession of Faith to be made by the Pope before his Election be declar'd, and likewise about Reformation as well in the Head as Members of the Church, and the Election of a Pope, the Cardinals, and Legates of Five Nations being admitted on this Occasion, enter the Conclave, and on the Feast of St. *Martin* chose Cardinal *Odo* Bishop of *Rome*; who, from the Saint of the Day, calls himself *Martin* V. *A.D.* 1417. This was in the Forty first Session.

In the Forty fourth Session, by the Consent of the Fathers, he appoints the next General Council to be held at *Pavia* in *Italy*; and in the Forty fifth and last Session he grants a plenary Indulgence to all

that

that had been present at this Council, and so dismisses them.

As to the Case of Reformation, this Council was very warm, especially in the Business of Heresy, as they call it; in which they are so transported with Fury, that poor *John Wickliff*, dead Thirty Years before, cannot escape them; whose Doctrine in the Eighth Session they declare heretical, erroneous, and scandalous, forbid the Use of his Books, anathematizes him tho' dead, as dying impenitent, and condemn his Bones to be digg'd up and scatter'd. With like Moderation they treat *John Huss*, whom, notwithstanding their Promise of safe Conduct, unheard and unconvicted, they commit first to Prison, and exhibiting Thirty Articles against him, declare him a Heretick, condemn him to be degraded, and his Writings and his Person to be burnt, very much against the Inclination of the Emperor *Sigismund*. *Jerome* of *Prague* being mov'd at the Barbarity of this Sentence, publickly shews his Dislike of it, for which, as a Follower of *Wickliff* and *Huss*, he is accus'd of Heresy; but at that Time being shock'd at the Apprehension of the Sentence, he submits himself and his Opinions to the Council, writing a Retractation with his own Hand, which he in Person pronounc'd, and deliver'd to the Council. But afterwards reflecting on himself, and with Horror detesting his ABJURATION, with great Prudence and Judgment, and no less Resolution and Presence of Mind, he preaches up *Huss*'s Doctrine, bravely defending it against all Opposers, till the *good Fathers* of this Council, Session XXI. answer'd him with the old Argument of Fire and Faggot, and stop'd his Breath; decreeing against all Favourers and Followers of him.

In the Thirteenth Session, contrary to the very Institution of Christ, and Practice of the Primitive Church, (which they themselves in express Words own)

own) they forbid every Priest, upon Pain of Excommunication, to administer the Blessed Eucharist in both Kinds. *Licet Christus suis Discipulis administraverit sub utraq; Specie Panis & Vini, &c. Con. T.* 12. *p.* 100. *Et in Margine: Hoc tamen non obstante, Sacrorum Canonum Auctoritas laudabilis, & approbata Consuetudo Ecclesiæ, servavit & servat, &c.* "Tho' our Saviour Christ instituted the Sacrament otherwise, by "administring it to his Disciples in both Kinds, yet "notwithstanding all this, the laudable Authority of "the Canons, and the known Custom of the Church, "this Custom is introduc'd." That is in plain *English*, the corrupt Practices of a Council by Tract of Time and Increase of Wickedness pass into a Law, are above the Power of the Blessed Institutor of the Holy Sacrament, and are a more authentick Standard than his Holy Word. For what else can their *hoc non obstante* mean, but to correct the Author and Finisher of our Faith, and pretend to mend his Holy Institution. This I take to be a natural Inference, tho' the Editors, in the Citation aforesaid, are pleased to give no other Reason for it than this, *viz. That the Body and Blood of Christ are as truly contained in the Bread as in the Wine.* If this were granted, (tho' after their own Way, since their Doctrine of Transubstantiation) Why then cannot the Clergy receive the Body and Blood in One Element as well as in Two? This is conjuring Work indeed, and like extracting Two different Species from One simple Principle.

Benedict XIII. dying *A. D.* 1423, one *Ægidius* is created Pope in his Room; but by the Help of *Alphonsus* King of *Arragon*, *Ægidius*, who called himself *Clement* VIII. was persuaded to resign, and so there was an End put to a dreadful Schism, which had for One and fifty Years thrown the Christian World into dangerous Convulsions.

And

And here it is worth while to obſerve what a Legacy Pope *Benedict* XIII. left behind him, and that was his Bull of Excommunication againſt all ſuch, either Emperors, Kings, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, *&c.* as had withdrawn their Obedience from him; which was to remain unrevers'd, upon them and their Abettors, till abſolv'd by him the ſaid Pontiff. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 1812. *& ſeq.* and if they did not ſpeedily return to their Obedience, they were to be depriv'd of their Dignities, whether Eccleſiaſtical or Civil, and all Subjects, Vaſſals, *&c.* diſcharged from paying any Fealty or Allegiance to them.

A. D. 1420, a Council was held at *Saltzburg*, the Metropolis of *Bavaria*, by *Everhard*, Archbiſhop, and Legate of Pope *Martin* V. The Firſt Canon of which obliges all to believe, profeſs, and teach as the Holy *Roman* Church does. And the Year following another Council was held at *Prague* in *Bohemia*, by *Conrad* Archbiſhop thereof, and the reſt of the Clergy, commonly called *Huſſites*, who were for Reformation, to take off the Scandal of Hereſy, which they unjuſtly labour'd under, ſolemnly decreeing for the due Uſe of the Holy Scripture, the Creeds uſed in the Primitive Church, the juſt Adminiſtration of the Bleſſed Euchariſt, and Reformation of Manners. This Council the Editors make no Mention of, but *Cochlæus*, in his *Hiſt. Huſſit. l.* 5. and *Dubravius*, in his *Hiſt. Bohem. l.* 25. make particular Mention of it.

About this Time there were ſeveral Councils held in order to ſuppreſs the *Bohemian* Hereſies, as they call them; the chief of which was at *Colon:* Where, amongſt other Canons, the Tenth is a Confirmation of what had formerly been decreed in Favour of Image-Worſhip and Invocation of the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, with this Addition, as the Reaſon of it. *Every Morning and Evening the great Bell of every Church ſhall toll three Times, in Memory of the Compaſſion of the*

Bleſſed

Blessed Virgin Mary, *to put the Faithful of Christ in Mind, that they should worship her with an Angelick Salutation, that she, whom her Son denies nothing, and always honours, may intercede to him for us.* And in the next Canon, to give the more authentick Face to it, they institute an annual Feast to the Memory of the foresaid Compassion of the Blessed Virgin; granting an Indulgence of Forty Days from all Pennances enjoin'd on them who shall devoutly observe this Feast. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 364, 365.

A. D. 1423, according to the Decree of the Council of *Constance*, a Council met at *Pavia* in *May*: But by reason of the Plague, which rag'd there very much, was translated thence to *Seyn*, and began there in *November*, Four Legates of the Pontifical See presiding. In which they declare severely against *John Huss*'s Heresy, (as they call it) against *Benedict* XIII. and his Schismatical Successors; but when they began to deliberate about the Reformation of the Ecclesiastick State, Pope *Martin* V. well knowing that they aim'd at him, takes Occasion, from the several Wars then breaking out among the Christian Princes, to dissolve the Synod, and appoints a General Council to be held Seven Years after at the City of *Basil*. Which is accordingly done, and on the 23d of *July*, *A. D.* 1431, the Fathers met in Council, over which, by the Consent of *Martin* V. (who died before the Council met) and his Successor Pope *Eugene* IV. *Julian* Cardinal of St. *Angelo* is chosen Legate and President, the Emperor *Sigismund* protecting them.

[1431.] *Gabriel Condelmer*, a *Venetian* by Birth, succeeds Pope *Martin* V. under the Name of *Eugene* IV. a Man of so turbulent a Nature, says *Stella*, *Vit. Pontif. Basil*, 1507. that in the Beginning of his Pontificate he put both Church and State into the greatest Disorder; and forcing the People of *Rome* to take Arms, they turn upon him, and oblige him to

make his Escape, which he did in Disguise, they pursuing him with the utmost Fury. Pope *Eugene* flies to *Florence*, and the *Romans*, taking the Advantage of his Absence, attempt the Recovery of their ancient Liberties, which Pope *Boniface* IX. had deprivʼd them of, removing the Pontifical Magistrates, and putting in People of their own. During Pope *Eugene*'s Stay at *Florence*, the General Council of *Basil* begins, where the above-mentioned *Julian*, Cardinal of St. *Angelo*, presides as his Legate.

The Three chief Causes for which this Council was held were, 1. For preserving the Purity of the Faith. 2. For reconciling the Christian Princes. 3. For reforming the Church both in Head and Members.

1. As to the Business of Faith, Legates are orderʼd to the *Bohemians*, to invite them to the Council, offering them safe Conduct; which they receiving from the Council and the Emperor *Sigismund*, send their Deputies to *Basil*; who being kindly received by the Council, demand Four Things; 1. That the Eucharist might be administred in both Kinds throughout *Bohemia* and *Moravia*. 2. That all mortal Sins, especially publick ones, might be restrained by those who had proper Cognisance of them. 3. That the Word of God might be faithfully and freely preached by the Priesthood. 4. That the Clergy should be obligʼd to forbear all Temporal Dominion. These Postulatums granted, they were ready to return to the Church of *Rome*, and continue in Unity with her. About these Demands there were many Debates in private Assemblies, but nothing was resolved in Council, except that in the Thirtieth Session, *Decemb.* 23. 1437. it was decreed, *That the Eucharist should be administred but in one Kind to the Laity, that Christ was entirely in either Kind, and that the Custom of the Church should be esteemʼd as a Law.* Besides several Particu-

lars, these Two great Points were carried in the Thirty third Session, First: *The Power of a General Council above a Pope.* Secondly, *That a Council could not be dissolv'd or translated to any other Place without the Consent of Two Parts.* Which Decrees whoever oppos'd was declar'd an Heretick.

II. As to the Business of Peace, the Council sent Legates to the differing Princes, by whose Mediation the King of *France* and the Duke of *Burgundy* are reconcil'd; and they might probably have succeeded among other Princes, had not the Differences between the Council and Pope *Eugene* about the supreme Authority frustrated the good Work, and very much retarded the Business of Reformation.

III. As to the Case of Reformation both in the Head and Members of the Church, there were many wholesome Constitutions made; particularly for the Recovery of the ancient Discipline against all Papal Usurpations, and frivolous Appeals. These were the Preliminary Principles attempted by the Council for a Reformation, and which had proceeded further, but for the Dispute about Authority, which the Council on their Side, and the Pope on his, strenuously assert: As will appear by the several Sessions.

Sess. II. The Decree of the Council of *Constance*, *That a General Council is above the Pope*, was read and confirm'd. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 477.

Sess. III, IV. *That the Council of* Basil *represented the whole Church, and that the Pope had no Power to dissolve the Council without the Consent of Two Parts; and further resolv'd, That he should neither call any Cardinals from the Council, or create new ones, except in Council. Ibid. p.* 479, 482.

Sess. VI, VII, VIII. A. D. 1432. *The Unity of the Church, and of a General Council*, is delared. *And that no Body, under Pain of Excommunication, should go to* Bononia, *or any other Place, to be present at a Coun-*

 cil:

cil: That if the See of Rome *should be vacant during the Council's Sitting, the Pope should be chosen in Council: That unless Pope* Eugene *recal his Bull for dissolving this Council, a Process be issued against him, and that he have nothing to do with the Benefices of those who shall adhere to the Council. Ibid. p.* 493, 496, 497. Pope *Eugene* takes this so heinously, that he recals his Legate, and commands that the Council be translated to *Bononia.*

Sess. X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV. *A. D.* 1433. Pope *Eugene* is cited to appear in Council, or, for not obeying, be accus'd of Contumacy, *ibid. p.* 502, *&c.* and further, if he did not recal his Bull of Dissolution, and within Ninty Days appear in Council, that they would depose him. *Ib. p.* 523. At this monitory Prorogation the Emperor *Sigismund* was present, which not a little frighted his Holiness; for it is most certain, that it was in Complaisance to the Emperor, whose Power he dreaded, and whom he knew to be very desirous of a Reformation, that he suffer'd this General Council of *Basil* to meet. And therefore seeing that the Council had in their Ninth Session, *ibid. p.* 500, received *Sigismund* amongst them, and having before his Eyes the Example of some of his Predecessors not long before deposed by the Council of *Constance*, he is forc'd to drop his Resentment, and stoop to the Council.

Sess. XIV. *ad* XIX. *A. D.* 1433, 1434. *ibid. p.* 523. Pope *Eugene*, to shew the Infallibility is sometimes erroneous, begs Pardon for his Letters written in Prejudice and Derogation of the Sacred General Council of *Basil*; declaring, that whatever he had attempted or done in Prejudice or Derogation of the said Sacred Council, or against its Authority, to be actually void and null; allowing the said Council to be legally continued from the Time of its Beginning, (tho' his Holiness for reasonable Causes had dissolv'd it) and that they were to continue to prosecute what they met about,

about, as if there had been no Dissolution; and in Confirmation hereof, *A. D.* 1433, he publishes Three Bulls, *ibid. p.* 529, 531, 532. all which were publickly read and confirm'd in the Sixteenth Session. To pursue this Thread of Story, we must pass to

Sess. XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX. *A. D.* 1437. This Year several Things occur'd which happen'd very commodiously for Pope *Eugene*: But none contributed so much to his Advantage as the Death of the Emperor *Sigismund*, the true Friend and Patron of this Council, and a great and sincere Promoter of Reformation. The Emperor being dead, and the *Greeks* at the same Time coming into the West to propagate an Union with the *Latins*, Pope *Eugene* lays hold of the Opportunity; for, all Apprehension of Dread being remov'd, he flies to his old Artifices, and whilst they are debating where the Meeting for the Union between the *Greeks* and *Latins* should be, he calls a Council at *Ferraria*, dissolving that of *Brasil* first. This Relapse of Pope *Eugene*'s was unexpected, after such solemn Renunciations of former Acts; however they lose no Time, but fall to work with him.

A. D. 1437. They issue out a monitory Citation, wherein they charge him with all Manner of Irregularities and Breach of Canons, particularly Simony, Perjury, Schism; and cite him within Sixty Days to appear in Person or by Deputies before the Council of *Basil* to defend himself. They likewise declare null and void all Nomination, Creation, or Promotion of Cardinals to be made by Pope *Eugene* IV. and upon his not appearing, pronounce him guilty of Contumacy. *Con. T.* 11. *p.* 581, *& seq.*

Sess. XXXIV. 25 *June*, *A. D.* 1439. In the former Session Pope *Eugene* having been declared guilty of Contempt, and suspended from all Jurisdiction, he is, as a Disturber of the Peace of the Church, Simo-

niac, Sacrilegious, Perjur'd, Schiſmatick, Heretick, *&c.* depriv'd of the Papal Dignity, and all Adminiſtration of the *Roman* Pontificate. *Ibid. p.* 620.

Seſſ. XL. 26 *Febr. A. D.* 1440. The Fathers of the Council of *Baſil* having declar'd null and ſchiſmatical all the Acts of the Councils of *Ferraria* and *Florence*, proceed to the Election of a new Pope, and chooſe *Amadeus* Duke of *Savoy*, *A. D.* 1440, whom they oblige by Oath to defend and maintain the Rights of the Church and General Councils, to extirpate Hereſy, to encourage Reformation, and to obſerve the Decrees of the Two General Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*; they at the ſame Time declaring him, *as only true and undoubted Paſtor of the* Roman *Church, to be obey'd by all the Faithful of Chriſt, as they expected Salvation.*

Amadeus, now Pope *Felix* V. in the laſt Seſſion of this Council, takes his Place as Preſident, and appoints a Council to be held at *Lyons* within Three Years; in the mean Time not diſſolving the Council of *Baſil*, but allowing it either to be continued at *Baſil*, or removed to the City of *Laſonne*.

But now it is neceſſary to return to Pope *Eugene*, who, notwithſtanding the Severity of the Fathers of *Baſil*, is not idle, or ſparing of his Fulminations againſt them; but, *A. D.* 1438, begins the Council of *Ferraria*, to which ſeveral Prelates of the *Greek* Church, in Hopes of Aid, repaired: But the Plague raging there, it was immediately tranſlated to *Florence*. Pope *Eugene* preſided in it, and, beſides *Latin* Prelates, there were preſent at it *John Paleologus*, Emperor of the *Greeks*, *Demetrius Deſpota*, *Joſeph* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, the Proxies of ſeveral Eaſtern Patriarchs, Metropolitans, Abbots, *&c.* After very warm Diſputes between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Fathers, both Sides agreed; tho' it was in a great Meaſure coercive on the Eaſtern Prelates Part: For the Empe-

ror

or *Paleologus* coming into *Italy* to sollicite Aid against the *Turks*, who had driven him to Extremities, did not trouble his Head about Matters of Faith, or the Rights of his own Church, the more to oblige the *Latin*, compels the *Greek* Fathers to recede from their own Authority and comply: And notwithstanding *Mark* of *Ephesus* and several other *Greek* Fathers, still tenacious of the ancient Faith, protested against such Proceedings, by common Suffrage it is determin'd, 1. *That there is a Purgatory.* 2. *That the Pope is the Head of the Church.* 3. *That the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son.* 4. *That unleaven'd Bread may be used in the Eucharist.* This, as it was on the one Side urg'd by Force, so was it assented to by the other not without much Reluctance, most of the *Greeks* with Sighs and Tears giving their Assent. Upon these Concessions the Council was dissolv'd, the perfidious Emperor sent back with empty Promises, and the poor Bishops return Home loaden with Grief and Scandal. I am the shorter on this Council, because there is something more still to be said of the Council of *Basil*; tho' it will be necessary to take in the Council of *Bourges* by the Way, by reason of the PRAGMATICK SANCTION made there, and which was taken *verbatim* out of the Two General Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* in Defence of the Church, *&c.* against all Papal Usurpations. This Council of *Bourges*, the Editors, *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 1429, will put in the Time of *Eugene* IV. and *Charles* VII. King of *France*, tho' the very Council it self rejects the Council of *Ferraria*, in which Pope *Eugene* personally presided, and approves and owns the Council of *Basil* which deposed *Eugene*. And in this Case no Author is more entertaining than that honest and learned Sorbonist *Richerius*, who most ingeniously and successfully engages the Champions of the Pontificate, and worsts them by turning their

own Arguments upon them. *Richer. Hist. General. Conc. l. 3. c. 7. p. 187, & seq.*

The PRAGMATICK SANCTION being, as is already said, taken *verbatim* from the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, was enacted to prevent the Encroachments and Usurpations of the Bishops of *Rome* over the Rights of the Church; of which no Part was more jealous than the *Gallican* Fathers, who always disputed the Rights of the *Gallican* Church in Opposition to that of *Rome*. This *Pragmatick Sanction* therefore, as taken from those two Councils, must of Course have the Ratification of several Popes; particularly Pope *Eugene* IV. who confirm'd all the Acts of the Council of *Basil*, *A. D.* 1434, as has already been noted; tho' he scandalously renounc'd all he had done upon the Death of the Emperor *Sigismund*.

But that we may take the Nature and Sense of *Pragmatick Sanctions* right, it will be necessary to observe upon what Foundation they stand. First then, we must consider, that the Edicts of Kings and Princes, which have obtained the Name of *Pragmatick Sanctions*, are those, *in which the Prince, with the Advice of the Wise and Learned, replies to the Request, Remonstrance, or Suggestion of the Judges, or any other Persons.* Secondly, *That to every Man born either to Civil or Ecclesiastick Communion, the Care of his Neighbour is committed by God.* Pursuant to this, Ecclesiasticks have the Right of Spiritual Direction and Correction over Christian Princes; who, on their Part, bear the Sword to oblige their Subjects to a due Observation of the Laws Divine, Natural, and Canonical. Not that they had Power to assume Dominion in Spirituals; for this *Constantine the Great* disclaimed, who would usually say to the Bishops, *Vos intra, Ego extra Ecclesiam, Episcopus a Deo sum constitutus: You are Bishops within the Church, and without the Church I am a Bishop appointed by God. Euseb. l. 4. cap. 24. Vit. Constantini.* And *ibid. l. 1. cap. 37.*

 he

he is called *Communis Episcopus, the common and œcumenical Bishop in his Empire*; the Word *Episcopus*, or Bishop, being not confin'd to a Spiritual Sense only, as the learned Bishop *Beveridge* observes in his Annotation on the First Apostolick Canon. And after *Constantine* several Emperors, as *Theodosius*, *Martian*, *Justinian*, *&c.* were truly Nursing Fathers and Bishops of the Church *extra*, supporting her Rights, guarding her from the Encroachments of Sacrilegious Invaders, and enforcing her Discipline against heretical Poison and Errors. In Imitation of these and others, *Lewis* IX. of *France*, commonly called the Saint, publish'd a *Pragmatick Sanction*. The Piety of his Design appears in the Front of it, being desirous, for the Good of his People, to restore the ancient Rights and Discipline of the Church, and to promote the Worship of God; both which at that Time were sunk very low in *France*. This *Sanction* of *Lewis* IX. consists of Six Articles: The First, Second, Fourth and Sixth, are for the preserving of the Rights and Jurisdictions of the Church, Patrons presenting to Benefices, Elections, Promotions to Dignities to be canonically observ'd, all Liberties, Franchises, Immunities, Prerogatives, and Privileges formerly granted, to be confirm'd and maintain'd. The Third to extirpate Simony. The Fifth, against all Exactions, *&c.* of the Court of *Rome*. Nothing is more conspicuous throughout this Sanction than an Air of true and sincere Devotion, no Affectation of Dominion in Spirituals, no Assumption of Power over the Church, but in Defence of it, creating a Law by his Civil Authority to enforce the Execution of the Canon. *Richer. Hist. Con. Gen. l. 3. c. 7.* There are several Copies of this *Pragmatick Sanction*, of which some are genuine; but that of *Margarinus Bignius*, in his *Bibliothec. SS. Patrum*, leaves out the Fifth Article, which forbids the Exactions of the Court of *Rome*, for this Reason, says

Richerius, ibid. p. 190. *That it might go down the better at* Rome, and escape any Note or Censure. But whatever *Margar. Bignius* may mean by this, its certain that King *Lewis* IX. intended no such Compliment to the Court of *Rome*, but rather to free the *Gallican* Church and Nation from the Usurpations and Encroachments of the Ecclesiastick Monarch; which, as the Fifth Article expresses, *had miserably impoverish'd the Kingdom of* France. *ib. p.* 189.

Nor was this *Pragmatick Sanction* of King *Lewis* the first of this Kind; for by the Sixth Article it appears, that those Liberties, Franchises, Immunities, *&c.* which King *Lewis* here enforces, were such as had before been granted to the Church and religious Places and Persons; but thro' Want of Discipline among themselves, and the Usurpations of the Court of *Rome*, they were in a great Measure obliterated and lost. And when by this pious Act of King *Lewis* they were likely to be restor'd, and that the Bishop of *Rome* found he could not oppose the pious Resolution and Inclination of the King, still to keep the Church in Subjection, tho' not to himself, (in Hopes of a more favourable Opportunity of resuming this usurp'd Right) he offer'd to invest the King with the Power of creating and instituting Pastors in every Diocess; which, its plain from the very Articles of the *Sanction*, he utterly disclaims, as not belonging to him. Particularly Art. 2. which shews his Intention to be for an entire Restitution of Sacred Elections. This malicious Cast of the Pope, *Richerius* confirms from *Chopinus, Tit. primo Monastici, Art.* 9. "When the Power of creating and "instituting a Pastor in every Diocess was given by the "Pope to this Holy King, and that the King's Am-"bassador had shew'd him the Pope's Diploma for it, "the good King replied thus to the Ambassador; "*I commend you for what you have transacted at* Rome *in Matters of Faith; but for the Present you have brought me*

from

from the Pope, (viz. *the foresaid Power of Institution*,) *I do not approve it, for I am sensible what Prejudice it will be to the Salvation of my self and People. Upon which he threw the Diploma into the Fire. Richer. ibid. p.* 190. Hence it is plain, that the Court of *Rome* always made it their Business to clog the free Course of Elections, being more willing to have Ecclesiastick Benefices in the Nomination of Kings than Sacred Electors; that by the interposing Authority of Christian Princes, they might the more easily make a Breach in the Rampire of the common Rights and Apostolick Discipline. But the Piety of the King penetrated further than the Policy of the Pope, for by refusing his Compliment, he frustrated his Holiness's Design. The next *Pragmatick Sanction* was that of *Charles* VII. King of *France*. This was publish'd, during the Sitting of the General Council of *Basil*, at the Council of *Bourges*, where the King, Dauphin, and States of *France* were present. The Proem shews it truly becoming the Character of a pious good Prince; for therein, first, the King disclaims Sovereignty in Ecclesiastick Affairs, calling himself Protector and Defender of the Church of Christ and its Ministers, and faithful Executor of those most wholesome Decrees, which by the Spirit of God were made for the strengthening and preserving the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church; to the Observation of which he acknowledges himself, as King of *France*, to be bound by Oath on the Day of his Inauguration. Secondly, as the Council of *Basil* deriv'd its Authority from the Councils of *Constance* and *Seyn*, (which were afterwards continued at *Basil*) and from two Popes, *Martin* V. and *Eugene* IV. it's certain that the Fathers of *Basil* establish'd many holy Decrees for the Reformation of the Church, which the Deputies of the Council brought to *France*. Thirdly, the King assembling the States to consult what was most expedient in this Case, it was agreed they should

meet

meet at *Bourges*, in which Synod the King presided, *Lewis* the Dauphin, with several Princes of the Blood, and the Chiefs of the Kingdom both in Church and State being present; amongst whom sat the Deputies of Pope *Eugene*, and of the Council of *Basil*. Fourthly, the Synod of *Bourges* would not determine any Thing proposed by the Deputies of the Coencil of *Basil*, before the Legates of Pope *Eugene* were heard; and then, upon mature Deliberation, they agreed to receive the Decrees of the said Council, some of them without Alteration, others only with some necessary Modifications and Forms; not in the left questioning the Authority of the Council, but for the more commodious adapting them to the State of the *Gallican* Church, and Capacity of the Kingdom and People; it being highly necessary sometimes, according to the Diversity of Customs, Times and Places, to make Alterations in Laws. *Richer. ibid. p.* 191, 192.

The First Decree of this *Pragmatick Sanction* declares the Usefulness and Necessity of frequent calling General Councils. The Authority of a Council above the Pope in Matters relating to Faith, Extirpation of Schism, and Reformation of the Church in Head and Members: That the Council of *Basil* ought not to be dissolv'd or remov'd by the Pope or any other without the Consent of the Council. The rest of the Decrees of this *Sanction*, like these, being taken *verbatim*, as is said before, out of the Acts of the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, I shall omit; and, before I leave this *Pragmatick Sanction*, divert the Reader with the Management of the Editors in the Abrogation of it. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 1432, 33. They tell us from the Tenth Book of *Gaguinus*'s *Compendium of the Acts of the Kings of France*, of a Report, that *Lewis* the Dauphin, (afterwards *Lewis* XI.) in his Fathers Life promis'd Pope *Pius* II. that if he ever came quietly to the Crown of *France*, he would recall the *Pragmatick*

tick Sanction. Which soon happening, the Pope put him in Mind of his Promise, by Cardinal *Balva*; and King *Lewis* sends the Cardinal to the Parliament of *Paris* with Letters for the abrogating of the *Sanction.* *Joannes Romanus* was at that Time the King's Proctor in Parliament, who, upon hearing the Cardinal's Business, with great Prudence and Presence of Mind declared, *That for his Part he did not approve of the Abolition of so wholesome a Law as the* Pragmatick Sanction, *and that to the utmost of his Ability he would oppose the Cardinal's Request.* With him the University of *Paris* join'd, appealing to a Council. The Cardinal, not a little incens'd, threatens the Proctor, but went away from them *re infectâ*, as likewise from the King. The next Story about abrogating this *Pragmatick Sanction*, and which is as little to the Purpose as the former, they pretend to take from *Papyrius Massonus*'s Fourth Book of Annals of *Lewis* XI. which affirms, that *Lewis* XI. in the Beginning of his Reign, did take off the *Pragmatick Sanction.* But this is poorly made out, for they say, that Pope *Pius* II. in one of his Epistles, calls this *Pragmatick Sanction* void in it self, as being made in a Time of Sedition and Schism, and diminish'd the Authority of him from whom all holy Laws take their Original. The Histories of those Times, even that of *Comines*, which wrote most in Favour of *Lewis* XI. do not make him appear a Man of the strictest Piety and Steadiness but these make him a very Occasionalist; for when he was Dauphin of *France*, he gave his Assent to this *Sanction* at the Council of *Bourges*; and to make him promise his Holiness if ever he came to the Crown to recal it, makes him like a wavering Trimmer of these Times. But the Editors, in the Relation of the Manner of the Abrogation of this Sanction, very imprudently destroy all again; for it was not recall'd publickly and in due Form, as it was first promulg'd, but poorly and sneak-

ſneakingly in a private Manner. The Letters of Pope *Pius*, ſay they, commend the King's Deſign of taking off the *Pragmatick Sanction*. *Among the reſt*, (ſays he) *we highly applaud your Manner of taking off the* Pragmatick Sanction, *without the Convention and Conſultation of many. You are much in the Right on't, and you ſhew your ſelf a great Prince, who are not govern'd, but do govern. And certainly he is the beſt Prince who knows how to do Right of himſelf.*

This was excellent Advice to a King, who in his Minority had conſented to ſo Sacred a Decree, and at his Inauguration had ſworn to maintain, defend and obſerve it! But to enervate, as well as ridicule the whole Matter, the Editors ſubjoin theſe Words: *Pope* Pius *wrote theſe Things not without Fear, as he owns; and that was certainly true, for the Convention of States, the Biſhops and Clergy of* France, *would never have conſented to the abrogating the* Sanction.

In the Abrogation, as the Editors call it, of the *Pragmatick Sanction*, they make *Lewis* XI. a Saint in the Eyes of one Pope. But here again, *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 1433. they make a very Knave of him: For in the Year 1479, which was the 19th Year of King *Lewis*'s Reign, and the 9th of Pope *Sixtus* IV.'s Pontificate, they mention a Convention at *Orleans*, for the renewing the *Pragmatick Sanction*. The Occaſion of this, ſay they, was chiefly owing to the Craft and Artifice of King *Lewis*, to terrify the Pope, and prevent Exactions of the great Sums of Money extorted from *France*. This indeed is probable enough, conſidering the Man; but it no Way becomes them to ſpeak ſo diſreſpectfully of one whom the Infallible Judge had called wiſe and beſt of Princes. Indeed, as they ſay, it may well be wonder'd at, that *Binius*, *Coriolanus*, and the reſt of their Creatures and Friends of the Pontificate, who have treated of the Councils,

are

are so silent in the Affair of this *Pragmatick Sanction.* [Truly I think it no Wonder, since I cannot imagine what can be said against Matter of Fact.] But this they take off presently, and say, *Let any one read the Eleventh Session of the* Lateran *Council, under Pope* Leo X. *where it is positively forbid every one to keep in their Houses, or in any publick or private Places, the* Pragmatick Sanction, *or any Chapter or Decree contained therein. That it should be expung'd all Archives and Places of Record, upon Pain of Excommunication, Deprivation, Infamy,* &c. *to Ecclesiastick Persons.* This Pragmatick Sanction indeed has been a great Offence and Scandal to the arbitrary Power of the Pope, and which the Editors would fain evade; but their Malice is very poor and impotent, their own Arguments turning upon them; and indeed, as they say of *Binius, Coriolanus, &c.* considering the Characters of the Men, I should be of their Mind, and wonder, if there were a Shadow of Reason on their Side; but as there is none, I think the Editors are more to be wonder'd at than they. But of this again in the Life of Pope *Pius* II.

Before we leave the Council of *Basil*, I shall beg Leave of the Reader to discuss some Arguments urg'd against the Power and Authority of this Council by several Great Men; in which I desire no better Assistance than that of *Richerius, ib. p.* 195. *& sep.* Tho' it may not be unnecessary here to premise something, and by great Men too, written in Defence of the Authority of a Council's being above the Pope. Among these, to omit many others, were *Abbas Panormitanus*; *Joannes Patriarcha Antiochen.* put forth a Treatise, which is extant among the Acts of the Council of *Basil.* But to crown all. *Nicolas Cusanus* wrote Three most learned Tracts *de Concordantia Catholica*, which are a well-stor'd Magazine of Antiquity, and Ecclesiastick Regimen; which nothing in this Age comes up to, if the Books were faithfully and correctly

rectly publish'd. But *Cusanus* at last, in Hopes of a Cardinal's Hat, which he expected from Pope *Nicolas* V. turns Tail, and takes Part with the Court of *Rome*. Notwithstanding which, and the new Part he was to act, he never retracted his Books *de Concordantia Catholica*, whatever *Bellarmine* says to the contrary, of which more hereafter. *Richerius, p. ibid.*

As for the Objections made by the Adversaries of this Council against its Validity, they are generally taken from the Cardinals *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, *Cajetan*, *Turrecremata*: Of all which, *Bellarmine* is the most polite and accurate; and these are manag'd *pro re nata* against the Council of *Basil* by others, especially *M. Andreas Vallius*, a bold and confident Parasite of the *Roman* Court. These, partly out of *Bellarmine*'s Second Book *de Concil. Auctoritate, cap.* 19. and partly out of his Third Book *de Ecclesia Militante, cap.* 16. draw the main Force of their Arguments, which we will reduce to the following Heads:

1. They most unfairly beg the Question, by taking for granted, what they only suppose, *That the Pope is by Christ constituted absolute and infallible Monarch of the Church.* Which being granted by their Adversaries, they must needs, as *Gerson* saith, *look upon the Pope to be all one with God*; and consequently the Council of *Basil*, which top'd this absolute infallible Monarch, must be schismatical, and without a Head. But notwithstanding these Flourishes, the great *Bellarmine* himself, in *l.* 3. *de Eccles. Milit. c.* 16. allows the Council of *Basil* to be a lawful Council till the Deposition of Pope *Eugene*, which was not meddled with till the 26th Session, and then the Council had sat above Six Years.

2. As to what *Bellarmine* says, That no Pope ever approv'd of what this Synod determin'd of its own Authority about a Council's being above the Pope; nay, that Pope *Eugene* did expresly reject that by

Name

Name in the 38th Seſſion; I anſwer, 1. A Synod lawfully met, as the Council of *Baſil* was, repreſents the Catholick Church, derives its Authority immediately from God, and, by Vertue of the Communion of Saints and Catholick Conſent, can decree. There can therefore be no need of external Authority, when the internal is obtained from God. 2. The Fathers of the Council of *Baſil* were ſupported by the Fourth and Fifth Seſſions of the Council of *Conſtance*, concerning the Authority of a Council above the Pope; the Canons of which Seſſions are no leſs than Five Times repeated, *viz.* in the 2d, 3d, 12th, 16th, and 18th Seſſions of the Council of *Baſil*, and approv'd by Pope *Eugene* himſelf, as has been already obſerv'd, and who allowed of this Council till the 26th Seſſion, *A. D.* 1437.

3. As to the Third Argument, That the Fathers of *Baſil*, at the Time of the Depoſition of Pope *Eugene*, were not a Council, but a Company of Schiſmaticks, Seditious, and conſequently of no Authority; it is begging the Queſtion to ſuppoſe the Council of *Baſil* ſchiſmatical, and without a Head: For Pope *Eugene* was elected by Order of a Council, and during its Seſſion; and if he ſhall, contrary to the Decrees of a Council, diſſolve or remove a Council, as if the Church were to be ſubject to the Deſpotick Will of a Pope, he is no longer Pope; but ought to be made ſenſible, that a Council derives its Authority from God, and that, as a Violator of the Canons, he ought to be depoſed. Certainly this muſt be granted, or they muſt contradict themſelves, That Pope *Eugene* did approve that a Council had immediate Power from Chriſt to direct and compel the Pope, and that a Council could not be diſſolv'd or tranſlated any where elſe, without the Authority and Conſent of the Fathers. Hence it naturally follows, that Pope *Eugene* could do none of theſe Things to the Council of *Baſil*,

ſil, and therefore he, not they, were ſchiſmatical and ſeditious.

4. They object, that there were but few Biſhops at that Time at *Baſil*; and that, contrary to the Method of Councils, they admitted Prieſts to ſupply their Places. This is as untrue as any Thing before urg'd; for at the Time of Pope *Eugene*'s Depoſition, and the Election of Pope *Felix*, there remain'd about Three hundred Biſhops preſent at this Council, either in Perſon or by their Proxies, as appears by their Synodal Epiſtle, *Ad univerſos Chriſti Fideles, de obediendo Con. Generalibus, &c. verſus finem.*

5. *Bellarmine* ſays, That God ſignally declar'd againſt the Fathers of *Baſil*, by viſiting the Place with ſo dreadful a Peſtilence, that the greater Part of thoſe who were there either died of it, or were forced to retire. This is of the ſame Piece with the reſt; for the Cardinal ought to have conſider'd, that Pope *Eugene* and his Party remov'd from *Ferraria* to *Florence* upon the ſame Occaſion, or rather upon a meer Apprehenſion of an approaching Peace. But further, to convince *Bellarmine* of his ridiculous Malice, it may with Modeſty be ſaid to look ſomewhat miraculous, that the Fathers of *Baſil*, and among the reſt the Cardinal of *Arles*, being ſatisfied of the Juſtice of their Cauſe, and deeply ſenſible of the Neceſſity of Reformation in the Church, for the avoiding of Schiſm and Hereſy, continued there Ten Years; whereas Pope *Eugene* and other Prelates fled from *Ferraria* to *Florence* upon the bare Rumour of a Peſtilence, being much more ſollicitous for their own Safety than that of the Church. But leaſt the Cardinal's Objection ſhould not anſwer, *Vallius* muſt put in his Oar to ſtrengthen the Side, by ſaying, That the City of *Bourges*, in which the *Pragmatick Sanction* was made, ſoon after the Diſſolution of the Council there, was conſum'd by Fire, as a Judgment on the Place. This

is measuring the Justice of a Cause from the Event; but he might better have reflected, for from the Time that *Charles* VII. of *France* heartily apply'd himself to the Reformation of the Church, and sincerely adher'd to the Council of *Basil*, where he had his *Pragmatick Sanction* ratified, his Affairs immediately chang'd Face, and the *English* soon lost what they had for many Years possess'd in *France*.

6. *Bellarmine* says, at the Time that the Fathers of *Basil* deposed Pope *Eugene*, the Council of *Florence* far exceeded that of *Basil* in Number both of *Latin* and *Greek* Bishops. And *Vallius*, not to be behind-hand with his Master *Bellarmine*, says, that none of the Eastern Bishops were or would be present at the Council of *Basil*; and therefore the Council of *Florence*, not *Basil*, was the œcumenical Council; because, says he, at that Time the Presence of the *Eastern* Bishops was altogether necessary, having not as yet revolted from the Church of *Rome*. His Bolt is soon shot! for the *Eastern* Bishops had long before separated from the *Latins*; else in the Council of *Florence*, why did the *Eastern* Bishops so earnestly sollicit an entire Union with the *Latins*, when the Points in Dispute between them were methodically argued by Disputants deputed by both Parties. This is plain from the Acts of that Council. But *Vallius* is again out in making Majority of Number carry the Preference between the two Councils; for since Pope *Eugene* consented to that Decree of the Council of *Basil*, which subjects a Pope to the Judgment of a General Council duly called, (as this of *Basil* was by himself) and that without the Consent of a Council he cannot dissolve or remove it, its plain that Majority of Number in the Council of *Florence* cannot exauctorate that of *Basil*.

7. *Bellarmine*, *Possevine*, and *Binius*, (*obnoxius Conciliorum Sarcinator*, as *Richerius* calls him) clamour migh-

 tily,

tily, that in the Council of *Florence*, by a contrary Edict, the Decrees of the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, for setting a Council above the Pope, were repealed. But this is altogether false; for there was no such Decree pass'd in that Council, neither do they offer to produce the Decree, or mention the Sessions in which it was made. But since *Bellarmine* is the chief Objector, he shall not only be Witness, but Judge in this Case. *De Con. Auctoritate, cap.* 13. "Altho', says he, afterwards in the Council of *Florence*, and the last *Lateran* Council, the Question about the Pope's Superiority above a Council seems to be determin'd; yet, because the Council of *Florence* hath not expressly determin'd this, and the *Lateran* Council hath, some Men question whether the Council of *Florence* was really a General Council; which to this Day is doubted, even by the Catholicks themselves." And *Vallius* in plainer Terms expresses it, *Quart. Part. Quæst.* 7. "*Satis constat Concilium Florentinum Auctoritatem Papæ supra Concilium non definivisse, etsi definiat eum esse Christi Vicarium, totius Ecclesiæ Caput, &c.* Its plain, says he, that the Council of *Florence* did not determine the Power of the Pope to be above a Council, tho' it defin'd him Vicar of Christ, Head of the whole Church, *&c.*" From hence it is beyond Contradiction, that those Decrees of the Council of *Basil*, till the 26th Session, which defend this Power of a Council above a Pope, are a Record unrevers'd; and that Pope *Eugene* and his Adherents, who separated from the Council of *Basil*, were Schismaticks and Deserters, and were notoriously irregular in the Breach of those Decrees to which they had before consented.

8. *Bellarmine* further urges, That the Fathers of *Basil*, with their Pope *Felix* V. had repealed their own Decrees, and submitted themselves to *Nicolas* V. Successor

ceſſor of Pope *Eugene* IV. which is notoriouſly falſe; for how could that be, when at the ſame Time *France*, *Germany* and *England*, and other *Northern* Provinces, ſtood by the Decrees of the Council of *Baſil*, and were very much enrag'd at Pope *Eugene* for hindering the Reformation, which was one great Cauſe of this Council's Meeting. But upon the Death of *Eugene* their Reſentment abated, and *Nicolas* V. being advanc'd to the Apoſtolick Chair, the long hop'd for Unity appeared more feaſible. Pope *Nicolas* V. forthwith ſends his Legates among the Chriſtian Princes to haſten the Peace of the Church; on which Errand he ſends *Nicolas Cuſanus* aforementioned to the King of *France* and the Emperor *Frederick*, according to *Ciaconius*, who wrote the Life of Pope *Nicolas* V. But *Monſtreletus*, who wrote the Hiſtory of thoſe Times, ſays, that the King of *France* ſo manag'd the Buſineſs with the Princes of *Germany*, and other Nations, that Pope *Nicolas* and *Felix* were made Friends. For although the King of *France* had acknowledg'd all the Acts of the Council of *Baſil*, except the Depoſition of Pope *Eugene*; yet remembring the Schiſms but lately extinguiſh'd in the Council of *Conſtance*, he never reſted till he had reconcil'd Pope *Felix* and the Fathers of *Baſil* to Pope *Nicolas*; which was accordingly done, and to put an End to or prevent any the like Schiſm again, Pope *Felix* formally reſign'd, and Pope *Nicolas* V. created him Dean of the College of Cardinals, and Perpetual Apoſtolick Legate in *Germany*; as appears in the Bull of Concord and Union at the End of the Acts of the Council of *Baſil*.

9. *Binius*, in his Notes on the Council of *Baſil*, affirms, That the Decrees of the Fathers of that Council were not allow'd by a General Conſent; and that many Prelates and Doctors of both Laws violently oppos'd thoſe Decrees. This in ſome Meaſure is true, but falſe in all the reſt. In the 33d Seſſion, the

two Decrees or Resolutions of the Council's being above the Pope, and that he could not dissolve or remove them against the Consent of the Majority of them, were oppos'd by *Panormitanus*, *Cusanus*, *Romanus*, and others; who exerted themselves against these Decrees, more in Hopes of a Cardinal's Hat than any Thing else: But as to the other Decrees, *Binius* is as much out as he used to be, as appears plainly by the Acts of that Council; for there were none but the foresaid who oppos'd any other Decrees.

10. *Binius* says, That, contrary to the Custom always before practic'd in Synods, the Fathers of *Basil* would not let Pope *Eugene* preside in the Council: Which is very false; for his Legates did actually preside, as appears in the 17th and 18th Sessions; tho' they allow'd them no coercive Jurisdiction, and oblig'd them first to observe the Decrees of the Council of *Constance*, which Pope *Eugene* must have done if he had been present. Thus, when some Men want probable Arguments, they fly to the most gross Falsehoods.

11. The same *Binius* complains, That the 18th Session of the Council of *Basil*, in which the Decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of the Council of *Constance* were reviv'd, was held in the Absence of *Sigismund* the Emperor, and the Ambassadors of the Kings of *Castile* and *England*. Which Objection the very Acts of the 18th Session disprove.

12. *Vallius*, among the rest of the Errors which he unjustly charges the Council of *Basil* with, subjoins this, *That the Fathers of* Basil, *by determining the Blessed Virgin to be free from Original Sin, and that no Body for the future should dare to teach or preach the contrary, were very much mistaken, since after that Pope* Sixtus IV. *left all Men to their Liberty in this Point, and the Council of* Trent *afterwards approv'd this Determination*

tion of his. This is very wide of the Business, in relation to the Fathers of *Basil*; for Pope *Sixtus* IV. was not promoted to the Pontificate till *A. D.* 1471. which was above Thirty Years after the Council of *Basil*, and the Council of *Trent* was much longer after: So that the Fathers of *Basil*, however Right or Wrong in their Determination, could not be said to mistake in relation to any Decree of Pope *Sixtus* or the Council of *Trent*. But to expose himself still more, he goes on, and says, *That the Determinations of ancient Councils, which were neither repealed nor confirm'd* [by succeeding Popes], *were always esteem'd of great Authority in the Church, by reason of the Multitude of Prelates and learned Men who usually were present at Councils. And therefore, the Decree of the Council of* Basil *about the immaculate Conception, whatever its Validity might be, tho' it was not Matter of Faith, was very much esteem'd, by reason of the Multitude of Prelates and learned Men concern'd in it.* The Council of *Basil* is oblig'd to *Vallius* indeed; for by the Inconsistency of these two Propositions he has brought them off, clearing them in the latter of what he had charg'd them with in the former. In which he is not unlike his Master *Bellarmine*, and his Brethren the Editors.

13. But after all, the Creatures of the Pontificate, not daring to trust to the Strength of their Arguments, take a more sure Method of damning the Credit of the Council of *Basil*: For, as *Richerius* affirms from the Testimony of Persons who very well knew Cardinal *Bellarmine*, it was at his Instigation, that the Council of *Basil*, with all its synodical Acts, were utterly eras'd out of the *Roman* Edition of the Councils. An Action justly becoming the Absolute Monarchy of *Rome*, to do that by Force which they could not do by Right. And therefore what *Gerson* said in the last Sessions of the Council of *Constance*, *viz. That tho' many Things relating to the Doctrine of*

Faith, and the Discipline of the Church, were decreed, yet they could not be put in Practice without the Assistance of the Temporal Power, may properly be applied here. For in vain hath the Church decreed that a Council hath its Authority immediately from Christ, that the Pope is subject to the Judgment and Determination of a Council, and that the Church ought to be reform'd both in Head and Members; unless Christian Princes, as Defenders and Protectors of Divine, Natural and Canon Laws, put those Decrees in Execution. And therefore the Fathers of *Basil*, in their Synodal *Respons. dat. Basil. Id. Jun. A. D.* 1439. very justly put this Quære: *Who can bear this most pernicious Error, that the Pope, by Vertue of his single Power, should translate and remove at Pleasure such great Numbers of Prelates, and of most wise and learned Christians gather'd out of all Parts of the World in Council? So that none shall dare to say to this Sovereign Pontiff, Why dost thou so?* As if the whole Church of Christ were subject to the despotick Empire of the Pope; and that our Blessed Lord had left behind him another Sort of Power than Spiritually Ministerial. *Richer. Hist. Con. Gen. l.* 3. *p.* 212.

A. D. 1440. A Council was held at *Friesing* in *Bavaria*, in Pope *Eugene*'s Time; where among other Canons, the Fifteenth says: *No Priest shall presume to say Mass without Lights, nor dare to elevate the Host before Consecration, least the People, adoring an unconsecrated Host, should be guilty of Idolatry.* This is a pleasant Inference indeed to excuse their own Idolatry, and inforce their Doctrine of Transubstantiation, as if the inanimate Elements were alter'd in their Essence by Consecration, and so consequently merited Adoration. But if we sensibly perceive them to be still Elements, is not the Idolatry the same after Consecration as before?

The

The 17th Canon of this Council revives and maintains the old Cheat and Forgery, which we have often hinted; *viz. That the Priest shall inform the People, that Women as well as Men, in Case of Necessity, may baptize Children with the usual Form*; *viz. In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: And that Fathers and Mothers, upon Occasion, may baptize their own Children after the same Manner.* Thus do they continue an old Abuse grounded upon a false Foundation: Which has not wanted cultivating in these latter Days; for here we may see from whence the Author of *The Rights of the Christian Church* took his Scheme of Lay-Administration in Holy Offices; not the only Abuses our wild Phanatical Enthusiasts have suck'd from the Dregs of Popery, and vilest Practices of the Church of *Rome.*

[1447.] Having done with the Council of *Basil*, we will proceed more particularly to the Life of Pope *Nicolas* V. He was of mean Extraction, but his forward Genius recommended him to the Care of Cardinal *Nicolas Albergotti* of *Bononia*, who soon introduc'd him to the Court of *Rome*; by which he was pitch'd upon for one of the Disputants in the Council of *Florence*; where he so signalis'd himself, that Pope *Eugene*, sensible of his great Abilities, sent him his Legate into *Germany*, to persuade the Emperor *Frederick*, and other Princes of the Empire, to side with him against the Council of *Basil.* This was accomplish'd, though, as has been observ'd by *Monstreletus*, it was owing to the King of *France*; but, however it was obtain'd, Pope *Eugene* had entertain'd such kind Thoughts of *Sarzanus*, (for that was Pope *Nicolas*'s Name before) that he rewards his Service with a Cardinal's Hat, and the See of *Bononia.* Upon the Death of *Eugene* he is chosen Pope, soon after which, making Use not only of the Emperor's Interest but his Arms, he obliges his Rival *Felix* to quit; whom

he continues in the Number of Cardinals, and creates him his perpetual Legate in *Germany*. Pope *Nicolas* was a great Patron of Learning and learned Men, whom he generously encourag'd, and amply rewarded, and had an Opportunity of doing much more, if he had not so busily concern'd himself in the Civil Wars of *Italy*. However he took many Opportunities of shewing his good Will to the Commonwealth of Learning; which he enrich'd with Variety of Monuments of ancient Writers, collected at a vast Expence from all Parts of the learned World, causing them to be fairly copied and plac'd in the *Vatican* Library. But besides all other Occasions which he made Use of to shew the strong Propensity of his Genius for promoting good Literature, the greatest Opportunity that could throw it self in his Way was *A. D.* 1453. and in the Seventh Year of his Pontificate, when the *Turks* took the City of *Constantinople*, and put an End to the *Eastern* Empire in the Christian Line. Upon which the most learned Men of that Country, compell'd thro' Poverty and the Severity of the Conqueror's Yoke, betake themselves to the *Western* Part of the World, especially to *Italy*, where Pope *Nicolas* V. well knowing the Value of this *Eastern* Treasure, so warms the distress'd *Greeks* with his Bounty, that they in Return liberally diffuse, not only the Knowledge of their Language, but of all Sort of more polite Literature, thereby inviting the *Latins* to a Tast of something more delicate and agreeable than their crabbed School Divinity. And that which still help'd to advance the Grandeur of Pope *Nicolas*'s Character in his Promotion of Learning, was the Art of Printing, which being found out a few Years before, was a Means of preserving aud handing down to these Times many excellent Monuments of Learned Men, which otherwise might have slept in Oblivion.

[1455.] Pope

[1455.] Pope *Nicolas* V. is succeeded by *Alphonsus Borgia*, a *Spaniard*, afterwards called *Calistus* III. whose Pontificate being short, few Things of Moment were transacted in it. He died loaded with Years and Wealth, making Room for his Successor *Æneas Sylvius*, who, upon his Advancement to the Papal Chair, takes upon him the Name of

[1458.] *Pius* II. a Name very disagreeable to the Character and Actions of the Man. After the lighter Studies of his Youth, he betook himself to that of the Civil Law, wherein he acquir'd such Reputation, that the Fathers of the Council of *Basil* made him Secretary of the Council, Clerk of the Ceremonies, and Abridger of the Papers; in which Council, as One of the Twelve Censors, he often pleaded. Here was his first Rise, and so long as he found it his Interest, he firmly adher'd to the Council of *Basil*. About the Year 1437, when the Schism broke out between Pope *Eugene* and the Council of *Basil*, notwithstanding the Anathema's and other Censures which *Eugene* thunder'd against his Adversaries, and tho' some privately withdrew, and others openly revolted to *Eugene*, *Æneas* stedfastly adher'd to the Council, as himself owns in his Bull of Retractations. *Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1411. *Cum nihil haberemus quod nobis auferri posset, perseverandum putavimus, ne Partem quæ verior nobis apparebat relinquentes, Detrimentum Animæ faceremus*: "Having nothing to lose, "we thought it our Duty to persevere; least, quit-"ting the Part which appear'd to us most just, we "should run the Hazard of our Souls." After Pope *Eugene* was by the Council depos'd, he acknowledg'd *Felix* as true and rightful Vicar of Christ, *ibid. p.* 1404. In the Year 1439, he was promoted by *Felix*, and soon after sent his Legate to the Emperor *Frederick*, by whom he was highly esteem'd; and, *A. D.* 1442, was sent for by him from *Basil*, and made Prime Secretary

tary of the Empire, and a Senator: During which Time he trims cunningly between both Parties, neither condemning the Council of *Basil*, nor declaring for *Eugene*. But as soon as the Emperor and *Eugene* were reconcil'd, he tacks about with the same Gale, and rivets his Interest in both; for at the Diet at *Ratisbon* conven'd to heal the Schism, he was the Emperor's Proctor, by whom he was twice sent Ambassador to Pope *Eugene*; and at last, by the Persuasion of Cardinal *Sarzanus*, then Apostolick Legate in *Germany*) (afterwards Pope *Nicolas* V.) he submitted himself to Pope *Eugene*, who was not a little pleased with gaining a Friend of so considerable an Enemy.

The Christian Princes, especially of *Germany* and *France*, having long groan'd under the heavy Burden of Taxes laid on them by the Court of *Rome*, were very desirous of a Reformation in the Church, to correct these Abuses, and ease their Countries of the tyrannical Exactions and other Usurpations of the Ecclesiastick Monarch. The Court of *Rome* was sensible of the approaching Storm, which they endeavour to avert by all the Art and Stratagem they could invent. But so long as *Charles* VII. reign'd, the *Pragmatick Sanction* gain'd such firm Footing in *France*, that the several Popes that liv'd in that Time finding the King inflexible to their Purpose, ply his Son *Lewis* the Dauphin with their most refin'd Politicks to bring him into their Interest. Accordingly Pope *Nicolas* V. makes the Dauphin's Confessor a Cardinal; and, whether by that Means, or what else, the Dauphin (as we have hinted before) promis'd, when he came to the Crown of *France*, to recal the *Pragmatick Sanction*. But this was like to prove a Work of Time, for *Charles* VII. was likely to live many Years, as it fell out. Whilst Things were at this Pass, an unexpected Instrument starts up in the Person of Pope *Pius* II. to give the finishing Stroak to this great Affair.

For

For considering his former Practice and Pleading in the Council of *Basil* against the arbitrary Power of the Court of *Rome*, they could entertain but small and unpromising Hopes of his being their Friend, especially in the Case of Reformation, in Defence of which he first became eminent, and recommended himself to the Fathers of *Basil*. Whilst he was a private Man, and ignorant of the Political Arts and Studies of the Court of *Rome*, (as he owns in the forecited Bull of Retractations) he was a strenuous and undaunted Champion of Truth, and the Necessity of Reformation. But, when from poor *Æneas Sylvius*, and but Canon of *Trent*, he became first, Bishop of *Trieste*, then Bishop of *Sena*, by his old Friend Pope *Nicolas* V. and at last Cardinal by Pope *Calixtus* III. he grew quite another Man; for thus arm'd with Grandeur, he made it his Business to entangle and perplex that Truth, which as a poor private Man he had bravely and honestly maintain'd This was a plain Taste of what the Church was to expect whenever he should come to be chief Administrator in it, which soon after happen'd. Though some were so weak as to expect from his great Abilities and Promises, that he would do something extraordinary in the Business of Reformation; yet, considering his prevaricating but a little before he was chosen Pope, they had no Shadow of Reason from his Actions to expect any Thing good from that Quarter. But such were soon convinc'd of their Error; for having obtain'd the Papacy, he falls in immediately with the Measures of his Predecessors, and verifies the Observation, That a good Man and a good Pope are inconsistent.

Upon the Death of *Charles* VII. *Lewis* XI. ascends the Throne of *France*; whom Pope *Pius* puts in Mind of his former Promise to recal the *Pragmatick Sanction*. But here his Holiness had to do with a Person of as much

much Cunning, and as little Integrity, as if he had been educated in the Court of *Rome*. Pope *Pius*, upon his Advancement to the Holy See, ſends Letters to the Univerſity of *Paris*, promiſing them great Inſtances of his Favour, which was with no other Deſign than to cajole and wheedle King *Lewis*; which he perceives, and therefore is not very forward in performing his Promiſe; upon which the good Pope begins to ſtorm, and threaten both him and his whole Kingdom with Excommunication. But this does not move the craſty King, who by his Proctor in Parliament appeals to a General Council. This gave Birth to a great Scene of Intrigue; and the Pope finding himſelf match'd, betakes himſelf to other Arts, putting King *Lewis* in a Way to recal this *Pragmatick Sanction*, ſo as to meet with no Oppoſition; (for he well knew, the *French*, both Clergy and Laity, were ſtrenuous Aſſerters of it;) which was by doing it without conſulting the States and Parliament. *Lewis* conſents, and to humour his Holineſs's Vanity, in a Letter to him abrogates the *Pragmatick Sanction*; which is ſoon reviv'd again; for what with the Appeal of the Univerſity of *Paris* to a Council, and the Addreſs of the Parliament to retain the *Pragmatick Sanction*, or whether the Pope's Breach of his Promiſe to the King about conferring Benefices on ſome Perſons of his nominating, and forbearing to exhauſt the Treaſure of *France*, was the Occaſion, it's certain that the King reviv'd it again: Though, according to *Monſtreletus*, the Pope's own Vanity was the chief Cauſe of King *Lewis*'s reviving it again: For he no ſooner receives the King's Letter wherein he abrogates the *Sanction*, but in Ridicule he expoſes it to the People of *Rome*. *Richer. Hiſt. Con. l.* 4. *c.* 1.

About the laſt Year of his Pontificate, Pope *Pius* II. publiſhes his *Bull of Retractation*, wherein he recants all he did in the Council of *Baſil* againſt Pope *Eugene*

gene IV. declares, " All Kings and Princes that had " revolted from their Duty to the Apostolick See, " should be reduc'd to their Obedience by Force; " That a Council ought to be subject to the Pope; " and forbids all People, under Pain of Excommuni- " cation, to appeal from the Pope to a Council." So that, to use the very Words of *Platina* and *Stella*, *Non Reges, non Duces, non Populos, non Tyrannicos, in se aut Ecclesiasticum quempiam delinquentes, Bello, Censuris, Interdictis, Execrationibus persequi priùs desistit, quàm eos ad Sanitatem rediisse cognoverit.* " He never left off persecuting " Kings, or any Degree of People that offended him, " or any Ecclesiastick, with War, Censures, Inter- " dicts, *&c.* till he had reduc'd them." No doubt the foresaid Authors give the Character of Pope *Pius* these Embellishments, to shew his extensive Charity, which no Power or Difficulty whatever could hinder from exerting it self; but the Reverse is more properly his Due, for from his first Promotion to a Bishoprick, his Arrogance appeared conspicuous in all his Actions; but more when he obtained the Pontificate, as is plain from his Bull of Retractation, wherein he imperiously domineers over all Temporal Princes, and what he cannot effect as a Pastoral Father, he resolv'd to accomplish as a Sovereign Bishop: So that, as *Richerius*, *lib.* 4. *p.* 5. well observes, *The Church of Christ was become the Seat of Faction and Party-Intrigues.*

[1464.] *Peter Barbus* succeeds *Pius* II. and takes upon him the Name of *Paul* II. He was bred a Merchant, but his Uncle Pope *Eugene* IV. having obtain'd the Papal Chair, he betook himself to the Study of Letters, and after several Promotions was created Cardinal by him. He was no great Admirer of his Predecessor Pope *Pius* II. and therefore immediately upon his Advancement to the Apostolick See, he rescinds Pope *Pius*'s Acts, and disgraces his Friends and Adherents; but sticks at no Means, either of Force

Force or Treachery, to enlarge the Pontifical Power. *A. D.* 1466. in a Consistory, he condemns *George Pogebrachius*, King of *Bohemia*, of Heresy, excommunicates him, and declares his Throne vacant, which he offers to the Emperor *Frederic*, but he refuses the Present, as questioning the Right of the Donor, who bestows it on *Matthias* King of *Hungary*, at the same Time sending *Roverella* Bishop of *Ferraria* his Legate into *Bohemia*, to stir up the People to rebel. *Platina* has spoken too plain in this Pope's Life, for which the Editors blame him, *Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1422, and say, he writes more like an Enemy than an Historian; and to take the Matter clean from *Platina*, they father his Account of Pope *Paul* II. on some anonymous Author in *Papia*; but subjoin, supposing it was *Platina*, *Who would not excuse* Platina, *if he were angry?*

[1471.] About a Month after the Death of Pope *Paul* II. *Francis Ruvere*, Cardinal of St. *Peter*, is chosen Pope, and assumes the Name of *Sixtus* IV. He was a Man of great Learning and Abilities, which raised him to several considerable Dignities; but his towring Genius could not rest till he had got Possession of St. *Peter*'s Chair, to which he was as great a Scandal as any of his Predecessors. For Learning and Brightness of Parts he was above the common Size of other Pontiffs, and his Liberality in enriching the *Vatican* Library with the choicest Books that Money could procure, shew'd his Love to it. But his Morals were so impure and lewd, that the Repetition of them would offend a modest Ear. He was the first first that granted a publick Licence for Stews at *Rome*, by which Tax he yearly brought in vast Sums of Money into the Apostolick Treasury. The only remarkable good Action of his Life, next to that of Learning, was his Patronage of *Platina* the Historian, who wrote the Lives of the Popes to this Pope's Time. He was born of mean Parentage at *Cremo-*

za in *Italy*; in his Youth a Soldier; but in his more mature Years he betook himself to Study, wherein he made great Progress. He was first entertained as a Domestick in Cardinal *Bessarion*'s Family at *Rome*, who recommended him for his great Abilities to Pope *Pius* II. and by him was promoted to the Office of Apostolick *Abbreviator*. But upon the Death of Pope *Pius* he was removed from his Office by Pope *Paul* II. and strip'd of all he had, for no other Reason than because he was esteemed by Pope *Pius* II. *Platina* deeply resents this Treatment; and after long Attendance despairing of Admittance to the Speech of the Pope, he sends him a Letter, wherein he threatens to appeal to several Kings and Princes, whom he should persuade to call a Council, and oblige him to give an Account of this irregular Proceeding. But poor *Platina* was mistaken in his impotent Resentment; for Pope *Paul* chastizes his Petulancy with Four Months Imprisonment in Irons, from which, by the Intercession of Cardinal *Gonzaga*, he was enlarged, and taken into his Protection. Three Years after, Pope *Paul* again commands him to be apprehended, and accuses him of Treason; which he denying, is put to the *Strappado*, and other severe Torments. But when either by Artifice or Cruelty they could extort no Confession from him, the poor Wretch is accused of Heresy, because he had formerly disputed about the Immortality of the Soul. But his old Friends the Cardinals *Bessarion* and *Gonzaga*, after a Year's Confinement, procured his Liberty. About Two Years after, *Sixtus* IV. succeeding *Paul* II. and well knowing the Innocency and Worth of the Man, takes him into his Family, prefers and enriches him, and, what he was highly capable of, commits the Vatican Library to his Keeping; a Trust at that Time no Man was so worthy of as himself. He was, in the Opinion of *Erasmus*, an excellent Historian, *si*

nactus

nactus fuisse: argumentum fœlicius; "if he had not un-
" dervalued his Abilities by the Meanness of his Sub-
" ject." And here let us leave Pope *Sixtus* IV. least enquiring further, we find this the last good Act of his Life.

[1484] *John Baptist Cibo*, descended of noble Parentage, and promoted to several Dignities by *Sixtus* IV. is after his Death chosen Pope by the Name of *Innocent* VIII. Though his Pontificate lasted above Seven Years, yet he had few Opportunities of exerting himself, except in the old Instance of undoing what his Predecessors had done, and imitating the worst of their Actions. For in the Year 1487. he absolves the *Venetians*, whom Pope *Sixtus* IV. had excommunicated; and in *A. D.* 1489. he excommunicates *Ferdinand* King of *Naples*, for refusing to pay to the Church the Tribute which Pope *Sixtus* had released him from, commanding him to be deposed, and absolving his Subjects from their Allegiance.

[1492.] We are come now to one of the greatest and horriblest Monsters in Nature that could scandalize the holy Chair. His Life is so well known to the World, that I shall only mention what relates to the Affairs of the Church during his execrable Administration. *Alexander* VI. before called *Rhodorick Borgia*, was a *Spaniard* by Nation, born in *Valentia*, of the noble Family of *Borgia's*, and Nephew by the Brother's Side to Pope *Callixtus* III. by whom he was called to *Rome*, and made Archdeacon, Cardinal, and Vicechancellor of the Apostolick See; afterwards Bishop of *Portua*, and Dean of the Sacred College. At last, upon the Death of *Innocent* VIII. he is chosen Pope, which Dignity he purchased of the Cardinals by Bribes, partly of Money, partly of Lands and Castles belonging to the *Roman* See. For the Good of the Church he did nothing: He had other Thoughts in his Head, the Advancement of his Secu-

lar

lar Interest out of the Estate of it; and to raise his own Family by its Revenues, were his sole Care: And therefore, contrary to all Right and common Modesty, he amasses up an immense Treasure by the Sale of Dispensations. The Editors indeed say as little of him as they can; but they must speak some foul Thing of him, whose Life was so notoriously scandalous in the Eye of all the World; and therefore they lump his Character at once, and say, *Initium Pontificatus a Pietate desumpsit*; "He ceas'd to be a good Man "when he became Pope." *Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1468. The first Handsel he received for his dispensing Power, was from *Lewis* XII. King of *France*, for divorcing his Wife *Joan*, for no other Reason than because she was barren and unhandsome. But that which he had chiefly in View, was the settling of the Secular Principality of the Pontificate on his Bastard-Son *Cæsar Borgia*, and thereby make the Patrimony of St. *Peter* the Inheritance of his own Family. In this Attempt neither Father nor Son were wanting. The Son with his Father's Help raises an Army, and most unjustly, without any Provocation, drives the Lords of *Flaminia* and *Umbria* out of their Towns; and the Father creates the Son Duke of those Provinces, and Prince of the Holy See, by Vertue of his Apostolick Authority. But these sacrilegious Undertakings were soon dash'd by the Hand of Providence; for having invited to an Entertainment the most wealthy of the Cardinals, whose large Possessions had rais'd his avaritious Appetite to a most voracious Pitch, he intended to have seiz'd their Estates as soon as he had dispatched them with a poison'd Draught; but by a fatal (or rather providential) Mistake he was the first Taster of it, and fell into that Snare which he had laid for others. His beastly Morals, his immense Ambition, his insatiable Avarice, his detestable Cruelty, his furious Lust, and monstrous Incest with his

 Daughter

Daughter *Lucretia*, are at large deſcrib'd by *Guiccardine*, *Ciacconius*, *de Rebus Ital. l.* 1. and other Hiſtorians of that Time, not to ſpeak of *Brietius*, *Annal. ad an.* 1492, *& ſeq.* and other more modern Writers, notwithſtanding what *Bzovius*, *Annal. T.* 18. ſays to the contrary, who would ſain waſh this Black Moor white.

Pope *Pius* III. who ſucceeded *Alexander* VI. ſat but 26 Days, and therefore I ſhall not interrupt the Story relating to Reformation in the Church from Part of Pope *Alexander*'s Time to Pope *Julius* II.

Tho' the Court of *Rome* had ever ſince the Council of *Conſtance* moſt ſtudiouſly endeavour'd wholly to obliterate the very Notion or Thought of the Neceſſity of Reformation in the Church, to blot out of the Minds of all Men the Acts of the Council of *Baſil*, and the Decrees of the *Pragmatick Sanction*, and to aſperſe thoſe with Suſpicion of Schiſm and Hereſy among the unthinking People who ſhould propagate any ſuch Thing; yet they fail'd of their wiſh'd-for Succeſs; for there were many good and pious Men ſtill, who publickly deplor'd the Ruin of Eccleſiaſtick Diſcipline and good Morals, and demonſtrated the Neceſſity of Reformation in both. To which nothing contributed ſo much as the moſt ſcandalous and monſtrous Actions of Pope *Alexander* VI. For Men did not now in Corners bemoan the ſad State of the Church, but complain'd in publick that if ever, now was the Time to reform both in Head and Members. This ſo rouz'd *Charles* VIII. King of *France*, that forthwith for that very End he conſults with the moſt learned Theologiſts of the Univerſity of *Paris*; who in Anſwer to his Demand ſay, *That the Pope once in Ten Years was oblig'd to call a General Council, repreſenting the Univerſal Church; and eſpecially at this Time when there was ſo great a Diſorder both in Head and Members, which was notorious to the*

whole

whole World. To the Second Question they answer, *That if in Time of Necessity, as at this present, or Ten Years since the last Council, the Pope being required to summon a Council, shall refuse or delay; that then the Princes, as well Ecclesiastick as Temporal, and other eminent Members of the Church, may meet together, and be a Council representing the whole Church.* To the Third Question they reply'd, *In Time of Necessity, &c. when any considerable Part of Christianity, as suppose the Kingdom of* France, *or the most Christian King its Representative, should demand of the Pope and other Parts of the Church to call a General Council, to provide for the Necessity of the Church, and he or they refuse, neglect or defer to call the said Council; nevertheless they who shall obey and appear, may without the rest hold a Council, and provide for the Necessity of the Church. Rich. Hist. Con. Gen. l. 4. p. 74, 75.* *Alexander* VI. does not care to hear of these Things, he too well knew a Council would upon slight Inspection find him a foul Offender, and therefore to secure himself in his ill-gotten Dignity, and to strengthen himself with the Sinews of War, he extorts vast Sums of Money, by laying the Tax of the Tenth Part of their Income from the Clergy of *France*, under Pretence of carrying on the War against the *Turk*, all which was done by his own single Authority. This indeed was no new Imposition, his Predecessor Pope *Innocent* VIII. having offer'd at the same; but the University of *Paris* three Times appealed to a General Council against such a Practice; and especially in the Third, forbid any of their Members to be aiding or assisting, by Advice or otherwise, to the Court of *Rome* in Prejudice of the said University and its Privileges, in this Matter of paying Tythes to the Pope; and at last the whole Sacred Faculty of Divinity in the University of *Paris*, unanimously agree in this Determination, *That the Church is superior to a Pope, whom they deny to be absolute Monarch of it; and that he*

cannot arbitrarily, and of his own Power, without consulting the Clergy, lay such a Tax as that of Tythes upon them. Rich. ib. p. 57, 69, 71, 73, 74, 75, *&c.* But to proceed to the next Pope.

[1503.] *Alexander* VI. dying suddenly of Poison, which he had prepar'd for others, and *Pius* III. Nephew of *Pius* II. holding the Pontificate but 26 Days, dying, as is suppos'd by the Editors, of Poison too; which was now grown very fashionable in *Italy. Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1477. *Julian Rovere*, Cardinal of *Ostia*, succeeds him by the Name of *Julius* II. a Man for diabolical Cunning and Pride no Way behind his pious Predecessor *Alexander* VI. to avoid whose Treachery and Tyranny, Cardinal *Julian* was twice forc'd to retire to *France*. And it is plain from what after follow'd, that *Alexander* well knew the Man, by the Caution he gave the Conclave, *viz.* To have a watchful Eye over him, least he should prove as *Sylla* said of *Julius Cæsar*. He was sensible of the Jealousy of his Colleagues, whom, notwithstanding all their Care and Foresight of his Perfidy and Treachery, he by a most surprizing Wile cheated: For when he had a Mind to the Pontificate, he was the Author of that solemn and authentick Instrument which the Cardinals were to sign and swear to before they enter'd the Conclave to elect. The Contents of which were, *That a Free General Council should be effectually held for reforming the Church in Head and Members: For recovering the Aristocratical Government in the Colledge of Cardinals; so that a Pope should not determine any Thing of Moment in the Government of the Church without their Consent.* This Instrument was ratified with horrid Execrations, which being by the rest of the Cardinals sign'd and taken, they were not a little surpriz'd to find the profligate *Julian* the Author and Promoter of it. Hoping therefore for some Good from this promising Turn, their old Suspicion of him ceas'd,

and they entertain'd such kind Thoughts of him, that they chose him Pope. Having thus by Stratagem secur'd himself of the Pontifical Chair, instead of keeping the Oath which he had lately made, he projects with himself how to keep his ill-gotten Title. First therefore he begins to list Soldiers, which he quarter'd in *Italy*, by that Means depriving the People of their Liberty, and any Power of injuring him. *Guiccardine*, who being an *Italian*, was far from speaking any Thing in Favour of the *French*, yet is forc'd to tell this plain Truth of Pope *Julius* II. in Defence of *Lewis* XII. *viz.* That it was *Julius* that incens'd that King against the *Venetians*. In short, as may be plainly seen in the foresaid Author from the Eighth to the Thirteenth Book, this Pope minded no Promise, Oath, or Obligation, but what immediately squar'd with his present Interest. Thus he dealt with the King of *France*, for having by the Assistance of his Troops taken *Faventia*, *Ariminum*, *Ravenna*, and *Cervia* from the *Venetians*, and annex'd them to St. *Peter*'s Patrimony; in Requital, truly he casts about how to deprive the King of *France* of his Hereditary Right of the Dutchy of *Milan*; and to drive him out of *Italy*; where he could not bear to see any Body greater than himself. To shew his Ingratitude, and provoke King *Lewis* to quarrel with him, he confederates with the Kings of *England* and *Spain*, and the *Venetians* and *Swiss*, against him. He likewise arms the Emperor against *Lewis*, by whom the Emperor had before been very much oblig'd. The Pretence to wheedle so many Princes and States into his Interest was, That the King of *France* had a Mind to get all *Italy* into his Possession. Of which Aspersion *Guiccardine* clears the King, affirming, that he had no other Design than to secure himself, and maintain his Patrimony in *Italy*. Pursuant to which, *Lewis* makes large Concessions, and stoops to Terms below the Majesty

of a King, to gain his Holineſs's good Eſteem. But the more he is courted, the ſhyer he is, and grows hardned in his Reſentment againſt the King of *France* and his Confederates; declaring in a great Aſſembly, that he look'd upon thoſe as Enemies that ſhould adviſe him to Peace with *France*. Being thus inclin'd, contrary to the Law of Nations, which the moſt barbarous and ſavage obſerve inviolably, the Duke of *Savoy*'s Embaſſador is by him put to the Torture, and ſeveral Cardinals are impriſon'd for adviſing him to Peace. Theſe violent Motions were peculiarly proper to him, and the Violation of the Oath he took as Cardinal, and confirm'd with dire Imprecations at the ſame Time, was the direct Impulſe of his wicked Inclinations. Wherefore *Guiccardine* from hence takes Occaſion to blame King *Lewis*'s Mildneſs, who ought rather to have corrected the Pride and Arrogance of *Julius* by Arms, than gentle Means. Which the King by many Provocations was at laſt compel'd to; tho' before he proceeded to Force, to juſtify himſelf to the World, he commands the States of his Kingdom to aſſemble at *Orleans*; in his Mandate to whom he complains, "Of the many Uſurpations of "the Pope on the Rights and Privileges of the *Gallican* Church, and the Laws of that Nation; which "for certain Reaſons he had patiently born, hoping "by fair Means he might have been perſuaded to "deſiſt. But he was ſo far from liſt'ning to any Ac"commodation, that he declar'd War, and incited "his Subjects in *Italy*, particularly the *Genoeſe*, to re"bel. Wherefore he demands their Opinion what "was moſt neceſſary to be done." Accordingly the Repreſentatives of the Church and State meet at *Orleans*, and adjourn to *Tours*, where Eight Articles are diſcuſs'd and concluded.

1. The Firſt was, Whether a Pope ought to make War on Temporal Princes in thoſe Countries which do

do not belong to the Patrimony and Dominion of the Church? The Council unanimously conclude, That a Pope neither could nor ought. This was necessarily previous to oppose the Universality of Power which Pope *Julius* had assum'd in all Princes Dominions. And it was Time for all Princes to look to themselves, since this Pope Militant had declar'd, That he would make as bold with St. *Paul*'s Sword, as his Predecessors had with St. *Peter*'s Keys. *Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1481.

2. Whether it was lawful for a Prince, not only to defend himself, but to invade the Terrritories of the Church in Possession of the Pope, his declared Enemy; not with an Intent to keep them, but to hinder him from offending himself and his Subjects? It was concluded, That a Prince with such Restrictions might.

3. Whether it was lawful, upon such an unjust Aggression, for a Prince to withdraw his Obedience from the Pope, who had incited several Princes and States to invade the foresaid Prince's Dominions? It was concluded, That a Prince might withdraw his Obedience from the Pope, not totally and indistinctly, but for the Defence of his Temporal Rights.

4. Such Substraction of Obedience being lawfully made, it was questioned, What that Prince and his Subjects, as well Ecclesiasticks at Laicks, should do in Matters for which they us'd to have Recourse to the Apostolick See? It was concluded, that the ancient common Law, and the *Pragmatick Sanction*, taken from the Decrees of the Council of *Basil*, should be observ'd.

5. Whether it be lawful for any such Christian Prince to defend another Prince confederated with him, and whose Protection he had legally espoused? The Council concluded, He might.

6. If a Pope shall pretend, That any Property or Right belong to him, as Part of the Patrimony of

the *Roman* Church; and on the other Hand the Prince affirms it to be his Right, but refers the Controversy to the Determination of good and honest Men; Whether in that Case, all others excepted, the Pope ought to make War upon that Prince? And if he doth, Whether that Prince may not resist, and other Princes his Allies assist him? The Council concluded, That it was lawful for that Prince to resist *de facto*, and others assist him *de jure*.

7. If the Pope will not accept what a Prince honourably and according to Law offers; but on the contrary, not observing the due Course of Law, shall pronounce any Sentence against such a Prince: Whether the Pope ought to be obey'd? Especially at a Time when it was neither prudent nor safe for such a Prince to go or send to the See of *Rome*, and defend himself judicially. The Conclusion was, No Prince was oblig'd to obey any such Sentence.

8. If a Pope, not observing due Course of Law, but proceeding unjustly, should arbitrarily publish any Censures against Princes, their Subjects and Confederates at that Time opposing him, whether he ought to be obey'd, and what Remedy ought to be apply'd? The Council agreed, That such Sentence was null in it self, and that it was not obligatory by Law or any other Way. *Richer. Hist. Con. Gen. l. 4. p. 83.*

However, notwithstanding these Determinations of the Council of *Tours*, they resolve first to send Legates from the *Gallican* Church to Pope *Julius* II. to admonish him to desist from these Undertakings, and incline him to Peace. But if he would not hear the Legates, that then they would appeal to a General Council, according to the Decrees of the Council of *Basil*, and proceed thereupon.

Whoever considers the Reasonableness of the Acts of this Council of *Tours*, promulg'd by the Consent and Advice of all the Bishops of the *Gallican* Church,

and

d the most learned Divines and Lawers of that ngdom, and examines them by the Rule both of ivine and Natural Law, he will find sufficient Cause admire the Impudence of *Binius* for calling this ouncil a Cabal. Nor is *Vallius*, *de suprem. Potest.* pæ, *l. Par.* 2. *Quest.* 1. more civil; who says, *That Pope has a Despotick Power over all Christians, and t it is not lawful to resist the Pope oppressing any one, n tho' he were a King.* From whence he concludes a ouncil has no Power over a Pope. But how inisistent is he with himself in another Place, *ibid. rt.* 4. *Quæst.* 2. *ad Calcem*, where he says, *If it should pen that a General Council is absolutely necessary, so that hout it all Things in the Church must run to Ruine; l that the Pope cannot be prevailed upon to call one, in b Case the Cardinals may call one; and if they refuse, the Primates of the several Kingdoms may meet and mons their Suffragans; And, at last of all, if the Prites shall refuse to call a Council, then the Bishops meeting ther in one Place, may lawfully provide for the Necessi- of the Church.* This is rare Inconsistency, *Andrew* inst *Vallius*, and the Catholick against the *Roman.* t to return to the Story.

Notwithstanding the importunate and pressing Inces of the Legates from the Council of *Tours*, to ire Pope *Julius* to call a Council, he would not prevailed upon, but resolutely broke through the th he took before his Election, and which oblig'd n in two Years to call a General Council. His nd is wholly bent upon enlarging the Patrimony l Dominion of the Church, which at that Time our'd under a greater Necessity of Reformation n Augmentation of Revenues. To compass this at Design, he encourages all his warlike Prepara- ns with his Presence, and besieges *Bononia* and *Mi- dola* in Person. *Guiccard. l.* 10. And some Time er being seiz'd with so violent a Distemper, that the

the Physicians despair'd of his Life, tho' at a Time when he should have had other Thoughts in his Head, he talk'd of nothing but War and Destruction. *Ibid. l.* 11. Whereas on the other Side, King *Lewis*, who had arm'd in his own Defence, and not as an Aggressor, uses all the gentle Means imaginable to quiet this turbulent Prelate; who push'd him so close, that he was forc'd to invade the Patrimony of the Church, where he behav'd himself with the utmost Tenderness, and was so far from taking Advantage of the Victory he gain'd at *Ravenna*, that he would not suffer the left Publick Rejoicing in any Part of his Dominions; being often heard to say, That tho' he never willingly or knowingly had offended the Apostolick See or the Pope, yet for the Reverence he had to both he would willingly ask Pardon.

Nothing having been left unattempted to bring Matters to an Accommodation, and incline the Pope to call a Council, in order to settle the disturb'd State of the Church, several Cardinals, under the Protection of *Maximilian* the Emperor, and *Lewis* King of *France*, *A. D.* 1511. call a Council at *Pisa*.

In the Account of this Council the Editors are very partial and unfair, all of them, even *Crabb* and *Cossart*, leave out this *Concilium Pisanum secundum*, and only name it; and both they and their *Index expurgatorius*, *Hisp. Madrit. A. D.* 1667. *&* *Index Rom.* 1664. *p.* 29. damn it, because it makes against them, tho' it was called by the Emperor, King of *France*, and Cardinals, and kept only by *Catholicks*, (as they call them) and that according to the Constitutions and Decrees of their own General Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*; and the Council it self, both in the Time it sat, and after, called *Sacrum Concilium Pisanum*, as appears from the Title of the printed Copy, *A. D.* 1514. *Constitutiones factæ in diversis Sessionibus Sacri Generalis*

Con-

Concilii Pisani. Vid. Bishop *Barlow, de Studio Theologiæ*, printed at *Oxford, A. D.* 1700.

But before we proceed to take Notice of the Authenticknes of this Council and its Acts, it will be necessary to see how the Editors behave themselves towards it, whether as a Council, or a schismatical Convention. And herein they are not sparing either of Railing or Nonsense. For *Cossart, Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1486. begins with a very unlucky Blunder, entitling it, *Conciliabulum Pisanum œcumenicum*, which indeed is a very odd Expression, and disagreeable in Terms; for none but the Editors are found to call that Universal which is Particular and Diminutive, as the Word *Conciliabulum* plainly implies, which signifies no more than a Cabal, or Meeting of a few; but the Word *œcumenical* is more, and affects a larger Number. But to the Matter of this Council, as they relate it, *ibid. When Pope* Julius, (say they) *had oblig'd himself by Oath to hold a General Council within two Years after his Advancement to the Apostolick Chair, being prevented by lawful Impediments, several Cardinals, with other Schismaticks and Hereticks,* (as they are pleased to term them in the Third Session of the *Lateran* Council) *had the Impudence to call a General Council without the Authority of the Supreme Pontiff, and to summons,* &c. *in Form, as if they had been a legal Body: And that, contrary to the Council of* Constance, *it was above Ten Years since the last General Council; and therefore since Pope* Julius *neglected to call one, it was Time for them to do it.* This the Editor's take from the Pope's Bull of Indiction of the *Lateran* Council, adding withal, *That to cover the Basenes of this Action, the Council of* Pisa *publish'd all their Orders in the Names of the Emperor* Maximilian *and* Lewis *King of* France, *tho' tis certain they were both ignorant of any such Thing.* And this they pretend to confirm by *Surius*'s Authority, tho' it utterly destroys it. *ibid. When these mad Doings* (says he) *began to tend*

tend to a Schism, Pope Julius *sends very kind Letters to them to invite them to return to the Peace and Unity of the Church; otherwise, tho' against his Will, he should be force'd to punish them. This Admonition prevail'd with Three Cardinals, but the rest continued obstinate, which was occasioned by the Encouragement of the King of* France, *for which he was afterwards excommunicated. Nor was the Emperor altogether innocent in this Affair, tho' he afterwards withdrew from this Faction.* Agreeable to which is *Onuphrius*'s Account in the Life of Pope *Julius*, in these Words: *The* French *puffed up with Success, and having the Emperor and the Cardinals that had revolted from the Pope on their Side, they call a Council at* Pisa, *to which they cite the Sovereign Bishop, who, good Man! having endeavoured all he could to make Peace with the* French, *now grown insolent with their late Victory at* Ravenna, *exhorts King* Lewis *to dissolve the Council of* Pisa; *which he refusing to do, the Pope calls the* Lateran *Council at* Rome. *Ibid. p.* 1487. Thus far the Editors out of the foresaid Authors; and which contain the most ill-patch'd Contradictions and ridiculous Inconsistencies that ever were invented: For,

1. They say, That Pope *Julius* could not perform his Oath for the calling a Council within two Years, because he was lawfully impeded. This is directly false; for, as Pope *Julius* himself owns in the foresaid Bull of Indiction of the *Lateran* Council, they charge him with Neglect of calling a Council according to his Oath, and therefore they did it. Besides, it is plain he had no Business upon his Hands to hinder his calling a Council, except his Wars with the *French* King, which were occasioned by nothing more than his neglecting to perform his Oath, and call a Council: Which Occasion had ceas'd upon his calling a Council.

2. As to the Charge on the Cardinals, for calling a Council without the Pope's Authority, and that their In-

Indiction was not jurisdicial, I shall refer the Reader to the judicious and sincere *Richerius*, *Hist. Con. Gen. l.* 4. *Par.* 1. *p.* 149. who, arm'd with the Authority of the best of their Canonists, lays down these two as positive Axioms. First, That when a Pope is to be accus'd of any Irregularity, his Authority is not requisite in calling a Council; for then a Council is above a Pope, and has Power to judge him. Secondly, when a Pope is negligent in calling a Council, because he will not consent to the calling a Council, a Council may declare against a Pope so refusing, as a Heretick suspected; and in such a Case his Power devolves upon the Council. This that zealous Champion of the Pontificate Cardinal *Turrecremata* owns, *Summ. de. Eccles. l.* 3. *c.* 8. where he says, *In such a Case the Cardinals have the Power of calling a Council.* And that this was Pope *Julius*'s Case, is plain from all that write in Favour of him; for the two Years being laps'd, within which Time he had sworn to call a Council, he was undoubtedly guilty of Neglect. But the greatest Scruple of all is this; granting, That in the foresaid Cases the Cardinals have the Power of calling a Council, yet this Power is lodged in the College, and not in the smaller Number; which is the present Case, there being but Nine Cardinals concern'd in the calling this *Pisan* Council. To this, *Richerius*, *ibid. p.* 150. *Sect.* 6. readily and fully replies, The Pope being excluded by reason of an Accusation lodg'd against him, consequently his Adherents are excluded too; and therefore as the Pope was excluded from calling the *Pisan* Council, so likewise were the Cardinals his Adherents, and the Power of calling the Council devolv'd upon those Cardinals who were not of his Party; for it is not to be suppos'd that those Cardinals that were of his Interest would act against him, tho' the Necessity of the Church requir'd it. But to return to the Inconsistencies of the Editors.

3. The

3. The Editors did very ill consult the History of these Times, in saying, that this Council of *Pisa*, the better to colour the Basenes of their Actions, publish'd their Orders in the Names of the Emperor *Maximilian* and *Lewis* King of *France*, who knew nothing of the Matter; which is a most notorious Falshood, as appears from the Edicts of those two Princes. *Richer. ibid. p.* 177, 179. The Emperor complains in his of the sad Calamities the Christian Religion in general labour'd under for Want of Reformation in the Church, insists upon the Decree of the Council of *Constance*, and his Holiness's Oath for the calling a Council; which the Pope neglecting or delaying, he instantly presses the Cardinals, whose Right it was, to call one. The King of *France's* Edict is to the same Purpose, but longer and more particular.

4. The Citation from *Onuphrius* is utterly false; for, as we have noted already, the *French* King was so far from insulting for his Successes, or taking any Advantage of his Victory at *Ravenna*, when the greatest Part of St. *Peter's* Patrimony lay at his Mercy; that he would not so much as permit any publick Rejoicings for them; but, tho' at the Head of a victorious Army, su'd for Peace with the greatest Humility, at a Time when he might have extorted it upon what Terms he had pleased. And as to the other Part of the Citation, *viz.* That the Pope had used his utmost Endeavours to reconcile the King of *France*, it's as notoriously false as the other; for his Holiness was the Aggressor in the Quarrel, King *Lewis* having suffer'd many Provocations and Insults from him, and long expostulated with him, before he could be persuaded to arm in his own Defence.

Before we proceed to the Acts of this Council, it will be of use to inform the Reader of *Labbe's* Observation on this and the Council of *Tours*, both which he

he condemns as Sham-Councils or Cabals, tho' upon no better Authority than that of *Binius*, *Coriolanus*, and such like furious Bigots. Which *Labbe* had the left Reason to do, considering how contemptibly both he and his Partner *Cossart* have often in their Edition of the Councils treated *Binius*, as we have before noted, seldom mentioning him but with Suspicion of his Fidelity. *Labbe*, in his Observation, *Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1488, deplores the Acts of the Council of *Tours* being publish'd by an anonymous Author, *A. D.* 1512. calling the Collectors of them heretical and schismatical: Usual Expressions with the Editors and others when they are at a Loss! But for his own Reputation, he ought to have spar'd the notorious Untruth which he subjoins, *viz. That* Lewis XII. *in his Mandate*, A. D. 1513, *should call that of* Tours *a pretended Council, and that he would never shew them any Favour or Countenance.* This is both ridiculous and false; for, First, it is Nonsense to make King *Lewis* say he would shew them no Favour or Countenance, when that Council was dissolv'd a Year before. And Secondly, it is not to be supposed King *Lewis* should say any such Thing of those whom he had call'd together by his express Mandate; as plainly appears from the Mandate it self. *Richer. Hist. Con. Gen. l.* 4. *Par.* 1. *p.* 81. So that *Labbe* must be guilty either of great Insincerity, or Ignorance; the first of which, I am apt to believe, may most justly be charg'd upon him; especially if we compare it with the Integrity of the honest *Sorbonist*, who fairly hands the Truth to us from authentick Records, whilst *Labbe* industriously conceals it. As to the Apology, and the Acts of the Second Council of *Pisa*, he did very ill consult Authority, or was very unjust, to say, that he could not find who was the Author of them; for, as our Bishop *Barlow* well observes, The Second *Pisan* Council was publish'd at *Paris* by *Hieronymus de Croaria*, *A. D.* 1514.

Bar-

Barlow de Studio Theolog. Edit. Oxford, A. D. 170. These malicious Remarks of the Editors, so unjustly grounded, and so unfaithfully transmitted to Posterity, are sufficient to prejudice the Reader against the truest of their Assertions in other Matters; but when they urge Authority in Defence of their Supremacy, Infallibility, and other modern Topicks, I must confess for my own Part, I shall question their Veracity, unless back'd with very authentick Proof from others.

In the First Session of the *Pisan* Council, the Fathers declare themselves the Representatives of the Universal Church, met together to reform it in Head and Members, declaring all Acts made or attempted by the Pope or any others in Prejudice of the said Council to be in themselves null, and as such to be observ'd by none.

In the Third Session it is decreed, That the Council ought not to be dissolv'd until the Church be reform'd; That a General Council derives its Authority immediately from Christ. That every one, even the Pope himself, is oblig'd to obey the Decrees of a General Council; and that the Council might be remov'd from *Pisa* to *Milan*.

Sess. IV. The Council earnestly desire a Reconciliation with the Pope, and offer him the Choice of a Place where to hold a Council; adding, that if he shall refuse to name it, they would proceed against him. At the same Time entreating him to be tender in the Affair of *Bononia* and *Ferraria*, now the Seat of the War, and to be sparing of the Effusion of Christian Blood, exhorting both the Pope and all Christian Princes to Peace.

Sess. V. They excommunicate all those who shall directly or indirectly molest or disturb the Council, or any one coming to it.

Sess. VI

Sess. VI. Pope *Julius* II. furiously driving on his Affairs by Force of Arms, despises the Sollicitations of the Council: Upon which he is charg'd with Contempt, the calling of the Council ratified, and the Council called by the Pope at *Rome* declar'd void: And the Emperor and King of *France* being threatned with his Holiness's Anathema's, the Council, in Spiritnals, take them into their Protection, and declare all Excommunications, Interdicts, and other Censures against them, their Subjects and Dominions, to be null; and, if the Pope in Four and twenty Days did not recal his Censures and Decrees against the Council of *Pisa*, they would proceed to a Declaration of Suspension; which accordingly they did.

For, Sess. VII. VIII. Pope *Julius* II. is declar'd, *Constant Disturber, and obstinate Persecuter of the Council, notorious Violator and Despiser of its Decrees, a daily Scandal, and stubborn Rebel to the Church, Promoter of Schism, Disturber of the Peace, an Incendiary among Christian Princes, blood-thirsty, and a Sower of Discord among the People of God: In all which notorious Crimes and Enormities He continuing obstinate and incorrigible, had incurr'd the Penalty of Suspension, and is,* ipso facto, *deprivd of the Papal Administration: Which Administration, by reason of Defect of Government, and that the Church should not suffer thro' a Vacancy, is devolv'd upon the Council, &c. Richer. ibid. p.* 287.

Pope *Julius* is not all this while idle, but to ballance this Council with another, calls one at *Rome*, wherein he immediately falls to work with the Fathers of *Pisa*, condemns them of Heresy, and curses them heartily. This he did to skreen himself from the just Resentment of a Council he had too justly provok'd to deal severely with him, who dealt so disingenuously and perfidiously with them. Besides, what they threatned him with now, was no more than what had been practis'd against some of his late Predecessors,

 who

who had been forc'd to submit to the Censure of a Council, even that of Deposition. But before we proceed to the *Lateran* Council, which Pope *Julius* call'd in Opposition to that of *Pisa*, I shall beg Leave to entertain the Reader with *Cabbasutius*'s Thoughts of these Affairs. *Notit. Eccles. p.* 568, *&c.* which truly are not a little entertaining, when we consider how hardly the good Man is put to it, to speak Truth on both Sides. He would fain seem to paint this horrid Pope *Julius* in the monstrous Colours he deserv'd, but justify the Pontificate; which are most irreconcileable Inconsistencies: For it is too plainly true, that few, if any of the Popes, ever studied the Advancement of the Pontificate but whilst they were in Possession of the Chair; being, whilst Cardinals, declar'd Enemies to the Pontiff for the Time being: Thus it was between this Pope *Julius* II. whilst he was only Cardinal *Rovere*, and *Alexander* VI. Ten Years of whose Pontificate he was forc'd to reside in *France*, where he took Sanctuary, to secure himself from the Treachery and Cruelty of that Monster, accompanying *Charles* VIII. and *Lewis* XII. Kings of *France*, in their Wars in *Italy*, and assisting them all he could against the Sovereign Pontiff. But he no sooner arrives to this high Post in the Church himself, then he turns Tail upon his former Principles and Practices, and reduces all within his Reach under his Obedience, but with the Help of the Arms of *France*; for which he afterwards rewards them, as we shall quickly see. The Character *Cabbasutius* gives him upon his Advancement to the Chair is short, but very black, *ibid. p.* 567. *col.* 2. *He was* (says he) *very powerful in Money and Friends*, [Two necessary Qualifications to procure the Papacy] *excellently learned, fierce by Nature, passionate, fond of Military Applause, bold and bloody. And, that he might not seem void of all Vertue*, [says my Author very wittily] *he was no Hypocrite.* His Impudence

pudence and Cruelty, which he acted openly and bare-fac'd, in the Sight of the World, may take off the Imputation of Hypocrisy; but when, instead of Hypocrisy, a Man shall engage notoriously in all manner of Barbarity and Villany, tho' he can by Force for a Time maintain himself, yet, tho' he is no Hypocrite, I hope none will be so immodest as to say such a Man has any Spark of Vertue in him, especially with the former Character our Author has given him: Which this Pope not only deserv'd, but a great deal more may be added to it, and from the same Author too, which we will take in as it occurs in Series of Time. By the Assistance of the *French*, he gave the *Venetians* such a Blow, as they seldom had before felt; for in the Battle of *Agnadellum* they lost Ten thousand Men, their General *Alvianus* slain upon the Spot, their Canon, Baggage, *&c.* taken. This was so fatal a Stroke, that the *Venetians* were forced to quit their former Acquisitions on the Continent, and content themselves within their Covy of Islands, called their City of *Venice*. These were good Offices not to be forgotten, and which upon another might have made some Impression; but they were thrown away upon good Pope *Julius* II. In short, there was no Town that the Pope had a Mind to, but the *French* Forces subdu'd it for him, *viz. Caravaggio*, *Bergomo*, *Cremona*, and several others. And yet this *Mortalium omnium ingratissimus*, *Most ungrateful Man*, to use *Cabbasutius*'s Words, forgetful of the League made with King *Lewis*, and the Obligations he had to him, and growing jealous of the Progress of the *French* Arms, which he did not know but might some Time turn upon him, he underhand, and unknown to the King of *France*, enters into Confederacy with the *Venetians* to drive the *French* out of *Italy*; at the same Time sending the Bishop of *Sion* into *Switzerland*, to persuade the *Swiss* to break the League they had sworn

to between the *French* King and them, and to take Pay under him; but the *Swiss* finding they could not mend themselves, stand firm to the *French*. However, Pope *Julius* gets *Ferdinand* King of *Spain* and *Sicily*, and *Henry* VIII. King of *England*, into his Alliance; and notwithstanding the Mediation of the Emperor *Maximilian* to reconcile them, the active Pope would not be quiet, but calls to Arms, and, contrary to the Expectation of all Men, besieges *Ferraria* in the Winter, which the Season of the Year ought to have dissuaded him from. However, to facilitate this the more, he attacks *Mirandula*, a Town belonging to the *French*, to prevent them from relieving *Ferraria*. Here it is poor *Cabbasutius* is put to it, for drawing near the Second *Pisan* Council, he is oblig'd to divide his Favour, like *Guiccardine*, between the *French* King and Pope *Julius* II. For as *Guiccardine* blames the King for his *nimiam Religionem*, *Cabbasutius*, *ib. p.* 568. *col.* 1. says, *Ex nimia imprudentique Bonitate peccabat*. And again, *p. ib. col.* 2. he says, *At Ludovicus, pessimo Concilio, &c.* Lewis *very unadvisedly defer'd his March into* Italy *till the next Spring, considering what a vigilant and powerful Aggressor he had to do with.* And continuing he says, *But by worse Counsel, very unbecoming the Most Christian King, and most fatal to his Affairs, which lessen'd the Honour of his Cause, and gave his Enemy an* Opportunity *of justifying himself, he, in Consort with the Emperor of* Germany, *by Vertue of their own Authority call a Council, to reduce Pope* Julius, *and choose a new Pope. Nothing could happen more fortunately for Pope* Julius *than this, for it not only gave him a more specious Title and Pretence for carrying on the War, but stir'd up the People against King* Lewis *as an impious schismatical Enemy of the Church.* But notwithstanding this, we shall find *Cabbasutius* smoothing up all again. The Council, which he says was called by the Emperor and King of *France*, he calls the Mock-

Coun-

Council of *Pisa*; which that Pope *Julius* might the more easily dissolve, in Imitation of Pope *Eugene* IV. who, to prevent the Council of *Basil* falling into a Schism, and to check the Power they assum'd over the supreme See, call'd a Council at *Ferraria*, then at *Florence*; so Pope *Julius* II. in Opposition to this Second *Pisan* Council, called the *Lateran* Council. But now to make Amends for what *Cabbasutius* said before of the two great Oversights of King *Lewis*, he commends his Management in the Council of *Tours*, from whom, he says, *The King received more wise and modest Answers than from the Assembly of* Pisa, *which publish'd most pernicious Decrees.* The Answers which *Cabbasutius* here calls wise and modest, are indeed so in themselves; but they are as dogmatical and positive against the Papal Supremacy, or any other *Romish* Encroachment of that Nature, as are any where to be met with. *Vid. supra, ad An.* 1503. And having set down the Substance of these Articles, the same we have already noted in the Pontificate of *Alexander* VI. at the End he subjoins the Opinions of the Historians of that Age, and who were Eye-Witnesses of those Transactions of King *Lewis* XII. and Pope *Julius* II. in these Words: *The best* Italian *Historians of those Times, and who were Witnesses of what passed, very well knew King* Lewis *to be so desirous of Peace, that he omitted nothing that might incline his Holiness to it. But the more* Lewis *condescended, the farther off Pope* Julius *kept, and from* Lewis's *Humility takes Occasion of insulting. Ibid. p.* 569. *col.* 2. War being thus resolv'd on, Pope *Julius* presses the Siege of *Mirandula* with all his Might, and encourages his Men with his Presence, where compleatly arm'd he acts the Parts of General and Engineer, himself directing the traversing of the Artillery, and playing them against the Town, which he took by Storm. Going from thence he attack'd *Ferraria*, which prov'd so tough a Piece of Work,

 that

that he was forc'd to raise the Siege with the Loss of the greatest Part of his Army. On the other Side, King *Lewis* disposed the Management of his Affairs in *Italy* in the Hands of his Sister's Son *Gaston* Duke *de Foix* of *Nemours*, and a very hopeful young Gentleman; who in a very cold Season, with a fresh Army, passes the *Alps*, and comes down into *Italy*. About this Time, Pope *Julius*, with an Army of *Spaniards* and *Italians*, laid Seige to *Bononia*, which the *French* General *Trivultius* had not long before taken from the Pope. But *Gaston Foix* returning victorious from the Siege of *Brescia*, opportunely came to the Relief of the Town, which was reduc'd to Extremity. But to return to the *Lateran* Council; in the Proem of which Pope *Julius* declares, That in his younger Years, that is, before he was created Pope, he was clearly for the due Celebration of Councils; but after his Promotion to the Holy See, that Purpose and Opinion of his was generally retarded or obstructed by the frequent Wars amongst Christian Princes, the reconciling whom took up his Time. Afterwards he adds, that a Heresy suddenly breaking out, (for such he call'd the *Pisan* Council) he was now the more desirous of calling a Council to extinguish that Heresy. "Wherefore, says he, I hope, by the Blessing of God, that "all Thorns and Briars will be rooted out of the "Lord's Inheritance, that evil Manners will be amended, that there may be Peace amongst Christian "Princes, and that all may join in an Expedition "against the common Enemy. That they would all "set him before their Eyes, *who is the Way, the Truth, "and the Life*, and study to please God more than "Men." This is very specious, but no more than what has been commonly used by these wicked Pilots of the Church, who never intended what they said; which will appear from the Acts of this Council, and will perfectly verify what *Guiccardine* said, *viz.* "That "in

" in the *Lateran* Council, Pope *Julius* did not in the " left intend to perform what he had promis'd, having " no other Thoughts in his turbulent Head than " those of War and Tumult.

In the Front of this Council we have the most elegant and polite Speech of *Giles* of *Viterbo*, General of the Order of St. *Augustin*; a Piece of Oratory, for its ingenuous honest Freedom, beyond what either Pope *Julius* or those Times could bear. The Design of this Oration is laid cunningly, and carried on neatly; a fine Air of Devotion appearing through the whole, accompanied with a correptive Smartness, (particularly on Pope *Julius*'s warlike Genius) and a truly Christian Tenderness and Compassion for the Calamity of the Times. There is nothing in the Acts of this Council so becoming the Dignity of synodical Liberty, and the Necessity of celebrating Councils, as this Oration; some Passages of which, for the Benefit and Entertainment of the Reader, I shall excerp. *Con. T.* 14. *p*, 19. *& seq.* " Synods, says he, " are so absolutely necessary to the Subsistence of the " Church, that without their Care it cannot be sup- " ported. They are like refreshing Showers to the " Meadows, and Springs of Water to Gardens; " like Culture to the Fields, Dressing to the Vines, " and Aliment to humane Nature: And whilst Sy- " nods are neglected, the Church, the Spouse of " Christ, seems in a State of Widowhood, in a me- " lancholy Undress, like Trees deprived of their " Leaves in Winter. Without them the Catholick " Faith cannot stand, Christians be safe, or the Car- " dinal Vertues, Temperance, Justice, *&c.* be main- " tain'd. For since we are by Nature prone to turn " Labour into Sloth, and exchange Care for Pleasure, " we are therefore under a Necessity of synodical " Censure, to correct our Morals and Lives; by " which Means wicked Men are reprov'd and pu-

"nish'd, and the Just cherish'd and incourag'd. "Hence arise those incredible Motives to Vertue, "which teach Men to love one another as Christians, to think on Things Above, to relinquish "Vice, embrace Vertue, and aim at nothing but "Good in all their Actions. It is this School of all "Vertues that, since the Time of *Constantine the* "*Great*, has produc'd so many glorious Luminaries "of the Church, the *Athanasius's*, the *Basils*, *Na-* "*zianzens*, *Chrysostomes*, *Damascenes*, *Jeromes*, *Am-* "*broses*, *Augustines*, *Gregories*, *&c.* all educated in the "Doctrine of synodical Discipline. What lasting "and inestimable Monuments of Learning and Dis- "cipline have these Blessed Servants of God added "to the Divine Treasury of Christ! After which this excellent Orator handsomely insinuates the Decrees of the Council of *Constance* for the frequent Celebration of General Councils, so formidable to the Court of *Rome*. Then passing to the Military Acts of Pope *Julius*, he slightly varnishes them over, that he may the more deeply affect him: But applying the Stress of his Speech to the Pope himself, he says, "God hath given thee, O *Julius!* an Opportu- "nity beyond all thy Predecessors, that at Home "thou mayst make the Temple the most magnificent "Structure that ever was seen; in War, (which "none could do before thee) make the Arms of the "Church terrible to the most powerful Kings, and "propagate its Empire by the Recovery of *Ariminum*, "*Faventia*, *Ravenna*, and many other Places; which "tho' the Enemy have been able to take from thee, "yet it was not in their Power to hinder thee from "being the First of the *Roman* Pontiffs who ever at- "tempted such Things; For the Valour of great "Princes does not depend on Casualty or Chance, "but on the Wisdom of their Counsels, and Gallan- "try of their Actions." This is a cutting Sarcasm,

which,

which, tho' it seems to applaud, yet highly condemns him, as the first Pope that acted thus irregularly. And what follows is altogether as reproachful, and plainly charges him with Perjury in these Words: "But after all these great Actions, two Things were "wanting, *viz.* The calling a Council, and declaring "War against the common Enemy of Christianity; "which Things you at first promis'd and determin'd, "and now at last have perform'd. Therefore God ex-"pects that you seriously consider these two Things, "and, in Imitation of the Prophet, extirpate Vice "and Error, and plant Truth and Holiness in their "Room. To the finishing of which, nothing hath "so much contributed as the Loss of the Army, "which I esteem the immediate Act of Providence, "to teach us to depend on the Church, whose Arms "are Godliness, Prayers and Tears, and whose Ar-"mour is the Coat of Mail of Faith, as the Apostle "says: To which if in a synodical Way we return, "we shall be superior to our Enemies. Let us con-"sider the War of *Moses* with *Amalek*, *Exod.* 17. "and we shall find, that so long as God's People de-"pended on the Arm of Flesh, they were always "conquer'd; but when they engag'd in Tears, they "never fail'd of Victory. Whilst *Moses*'s Hands "were lifted up, the Army of the Living God pre-"vail'd, but no longer. These were the Arms of "the Church at first; by constant Application, and "a Series of religious Duties, not by the Temporal "Sword, she subdu'd so much of *Europe*, *Africa* and "*Asia*; and whilst she wore the Robe of Innocence, "becoming the Spouse of Christ, triumph'd securely "every where; but that once exchang'd for Temporal "Arms, she was shamefully compell'd to relinquish "her former Conquests, is her self in a great Measure "become a Prey to Infidels, and *Mahomet*'s Banner "daily supplants the Cross of Christ. This we have

"seen

" seen in *Jerusalem* and *Ægypt*; and the *Byzantine* " Empire totally subdued by their devouring Sword. " Nor can we expect to escape these approaching " Judgments, unless we endeavour to avert them " with our Prayers and Tears. The Storm gathers " daily over our Heads; our Sins cry for Punish- " ment; and we sensibly lose by our Neglect of re- " ligious Duties, what our holy Fathers acquired " with continual Fervency and Devotion. When " was the Life of Man more supine and careless of " Danger? When did Ambition ever more abound? " When did Impiety more boldly advance against " and encroach upon Religion? And when was " there so great a Neglect of Sacred Truth, and " Contempt of the Keys, and holy Commands, *&c.*?" And then with a most pressing *Epanorthosis* addressing himself to Pope *Julius*, he says: " These Evils, which " we daily see and feel, are the Call of God, admo- " nishing and commanding you to celebrate a Coun- " cil, to reform the Church, to put an End to these " bloody Wars, to restore Peace to your Spouse, who " has long wanted it; to avert the Sword hanging " over this City and all *Italy*, and to restrain that " Licentiousness which has most deeply wounded the " Bowels of the Church. Look down, Blessed *Pe-* " *ter* and *Paul*, ye most august Heads and Patrons of " this City, and see in what miserable Confusion " that Church, is which ye established with your " Blood! Behold how her Armies are defeated, her " Fields covered with Heaps of the Slain, her Soil en- " rich'd with their Blood, and more Forces destroy'd " by intestine Wars than would have serv'd to repel " the common Enemy!" I could with infinite Plea- sure dwell longer on this charming Oration; but the Reader, I hope, will excuse so much as I have al- ready here inserted, it being chiefly intended to shew, that even the most modest and best of the *Romish* Au-

thors are not ſparing of ſevere Reprehenſions and ſarcatical Invectives on the Supreme Pontiff, when he ſcandalizes St. *Peter*'s Chair, which none did more than this very Pope *Julius* II. I ſhall now proceed to the Acts of the *Lateran* Council.

Pope *Julius* II. preſided in this Council, the firſt *Seſſion* of which began the 10th of *May*, *A. D.* 1512. and contains the Bull of Indiction of it. In which Bull the Cardinals, who departed from *Rome*, and call'd the *Piſan* Council, are compared to *Lucifer*, *Corah*, *Dathan*, *Abiron*, *Dioſcorus*, *Acacius*, and other Schiſmaticks and Hereticks. *Con. T.* XIV. *p.* 30. *& ſeq.* In the ſame Bull he pretends to examine the Reaſons of the foreſaid Cardinals for their Departure from *Rome*; though 'tis evident beyond all manner of Doubt, that their Safety was their true Reaſon; which they could but ill conſult, whilſt they were within the Power of ſo military a Prelate as Pope *Julius* II. He likewiſe very tenderly touches the Decrees of the Council of *Conſtance*, which juſtify the calling of the Council of *Piſa*: But when he talks of the Oath he took at his Election, of calling a Council within Two Years, he moſt wretchedly and lamely excuſes the Breach of it, urging in his Defence, " That " when he would have corrected thoſe notorious " Crimes that ſcandalized and wounded the Church, " it was objected to him, that the Supreme Pontiff " had nothing to do to call a Council, but that it " did ſecondarily belong to the Cardinals, in caſe of " the Pope's Neglect, to call a Council." This is ridiculouſly falſe both Ways; for in the firſt Place it is undeniable, that Pope *Julius* was upon his Election importuned to call a General Council; which he promiſed to do within Two Years: And, Secondly, he not performing this Oath, the Cardinals do it for him; the Right to do which hath been ſufficiently argued already; as the Apology of the *Piſan* Fathers, and the

the History of that Council fairly set forth. And here, as *Richerius* observes, *Hist. Gen. Con. l.* 4. *par.* 2. *p.* 7. it is very much to be wondered, that *Onuphrius*, *Panvinius*, and *Ciaconius*, who wrote the Life of Pope *Julius*, should so industriously leave out this Oath of his; which is a great Fault in Historians; and it was impossible so remarkable a Passage should escape their Knowledge: Which plainly argues them rather Champions of the Court of *Rome*, than of Truth; especially *Ciaconius*; who sticks not to oppose his own fictitious Inventions to the Matters of Fact, of which *Guiccardine* was an Eye-witness; with no other Design than to excuse Pope *Julius*, and lay all the Blame on that innocent Prince *Lewis* XII. which we have already discuss'd.

The Second *Session* was opened the same Month; which is remarkable for little except the Oration of *Thomas Cajetan*, General of the *Dominicans*; who took for the Theme of his Speech the XXIst of the *Revelations*, *v.* 2. *I saw* (says he) *the Holy City, the* New Jerusalem, *descend from Heaven: Which Words*, he said, *cannot be applied to the Council of* Pisa, *which consisted only of one Nation, or rather Part of a divided Nation, or indeed of no Nation; for it is no longer holy or lawful than when it recedes from Error, and adheres to Holiness; from which it still departs further whilst it subjects* Peter *to the Church, and the Pope to a Council; thereby inverting the Course of Nature, in setting Children above their Parents, the Members above the Head, the Servant above his Lord, &c.* Then he falsely goes on, calling them Aggressors in this War; *That this* Pisan *Novelty* (as he stiles that Council) *took its Rise at* Constance, *and there vanished: That afterwards it revived at* Basil, *but was exploded; and that even now, if they would behave themselves like Men, it should perish, as it did under Pope* Eugene IV. Then addressing himself to Pope *Julius*, he blames his Sloth; and, like a diabo-

diabolical Incendiary, ſtimulates this furious Pontiff, too prone of himſelf to Miſchief, with this impious and blaſphemous Motive: *And that you, O holy Father, may, in the firſt Place, imitate the Power, Perfection, and Wiſdom of God himſelf, gird on your Sword, for you have Two, one whereof you enjoy in common with all Temporal Princes, the other is your own Property, ſuch as no Body can have but from your ſelf. With this Sword therefore, which is the Power of the Church, gird thy ſelf, gird it upon thy Thigh, that is, over all the Powers of Mankind, and exerciſe it againſt Error, Hereſy, &c.* Con. T. XIV. p. 68. & ſeq. This is ſpoken with the Spirit of an Incendiary, very unbecoming both the Orator and Perſon addreſs'd to; to enervate which, *Richerius* honeſtly offers his Thoughts in the following Obſervations. *Ibid. p.* 9.

1. As to the Council of *Piſa*'s conſiſting of one Nation, it might more properly be retorted on the *Lateran* Council, which was held at *Rome* under Pope *Julius*, then in Arms, and in which there were ſcarce any but Court-Biſhops, ſuch as depended wholly on the Court of *Rome:* By which Means Pope *Leo* X. who ſucceeded *Julius* II. was enabled to continue this Council ſo long as the Year 1516.

2. Whereas he reflects on the *Piſan* Council for ſubjecting *Peter* to the Church, and the Pope to a Council, thereby inſinuating, That they inverted the Order of Nature, and ſet the Child above the Parent, the Members above the Head, *&c.* He abſurdly ſuppoſes *Peter* and the Pope to be the internal and eſſential Head of the Church, which are but only miniſterial; making no Difference between Chriſt the Lord, and *Peter* the Steward. Certainly the Pope, who is but a Part and Member of the Church, muſt neceſſarily be ſubject to the Church, and a General Council, which repreſents the Church, as a Part is to the whole, the Inſtrument to the Artificer, the

the Eye to the Man, and the Medium to its End: For which Reason, like other Men, he is obliged to ask Absolution of the Church, and to hold that Article of Faith, *I believe in the Holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints, Forgiveness of Sins.*

3. It is very unjustly charged upon the *Pisan* Fathers, that they stirr'd up War against the *Roman* Church; whereas it is plain, that *Lewis* XII. who protected this Council, suffered many Provocations and Insults from Pope *Julius*, before he arm'd in his own and their Defence. But it is peculiar to the *Italian* Writers to skreen the Arts of the Court of *Rome* under the Name and Person of the Church; for to oppose the Court and to oppose the Church are Two distinct Things, according to *Joannes Major Commentar. in Matthæum, cap.* 18. *A Man may oppose the Pope, and yet be within the Church, and in a State of Salvation.*

4. *Cajetan* plainly shews with what Spirit he is actuated, when he asserts the *Pisan* Council, which he calls Novelty, to take its Original from *Constance*, its Recovery from *Basil*, and its Suppression from Pope *Eugene* IV. *&c.* because the Question was accurately deliberated in those Two Councils, and Pope *Eugene* carried his Point by meer Force. And this is the hopeful Example *Cajetan* proposes to Pope *Julius*, very unbecoming the pastoral Office, and the mild Practice of the Law of Grace.

5. In his Claim of the Temporal Sword to the Pope, he indeed speaks Pope *Boniface* VIII.'s Mind, not the Sense of the Gospel, which teacheth, that the Power of the Church is purely ministerially spiritual, void of all Dominion, and absolute Coercion which consists in external Force.

6. His Assertion is false, where he says, that all Bishops receive the Spiritual Sword from the Pope: For the Holy Scriptures inform us, That the Keys or Power

Power of Jurisdiction was given in common to all the Apostles, whose Successors Bishops were. And this *Bellarmine, de Rom. Pont. c.* 23. owns: *Vides*, ait, *idem dari Apostolis per illa verba Joannis* 20. *Ego mitto vos*; "You see, the same was given to the Apostles, "by these Words of *John, c.* 20. *v.* 21. *I send you.*

7. Instead of a Peace-maker and good *Samaritan*, he acts the Part of a *Boute-feu*, and is the Trumpet to War and Destruction; which he might very well have spared, considering the warlike Disposition of Pope *Julius*, which wanted no Stimulation. Instead of this Inflammatory Incentive, ill becoming the Character of a religious Man and Professor of Divinity, he should for his Imitation have set before his Eyes the Example of that good Man *Giles* of *Viterbo*, and have endeavoured to persuade the turbulent *Julius* to give Peace to the Christian World, and stop the Effusion of its Blood.

The Third Session was held *December* 3. *A. D.* 1512. in which was read the Emperor *Maximilian*'s Letter; wherein he renounces the Councils of *Pisa* and *Tours*, and declares for the *Lateran* Council. But this was not so much an Act of his Judgment or Opinion, as his Interest, if *Guiccardine* may be believed, who declares the Emperor came over to the *Lateran* Council in hopes of recovering some Cities of *Italy*. The same Session the whole Kingdom of *France*, except the Dukedom of *Britany*, is put under Interdict, and the Fair of *Lyons* removed by Pope *Julius* to *Geneva*. This must be purely to shew his Power in Temporal Affairs, for the Act itself has no Relation to Ecclesiastical Institution, but is a direct Act of the Court of *Rome*. *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 82.

The Fourth Session was *December* 10. the same Year; in which the Edict of *Lewis* XI. King of *France*, for abrogating the *Pragmatick Sanction*, is reviv'd, with a Monitory of Pope *Julius* against all Favourers

Favourers and Asserters of it, meaning the King and Clergy of *France*, whom he peremptorily cites to renounce the foresaid *Sanction*, and declare it void.

The Fifth Session was held *February* 16. 1513. in which Cardinal *Riarius* presided, Pope *Julius* being sick. Here the Bull against Simoniacal Elections of the Popes was read and agreed to by all except Five, says *Binius*, in his Notes on this Council and Session, *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 344. This *Richerius* wonders at, *ib. p.* 11. because, says he, it was rumour'd that Pope *Julius* himself made his Way to the Pontificate by Bribes. Of his Mind is *Guiccardine*, *l.* 6. But it might be the Effect of Repentance; if so, 'twas better some Way than none, better late than never. *Cabbasutius*, who is very tender of the Pontificate, and a mighty Champion in Defence of the *Lateran* Council, in Opposition to those of *Pisa*, *Constance*, and *Basil*, cannot yet forbear reflecting on the wicked Designs and Actions of Pope *Julius* II. *Notit. Eccles. p.* 570. where citing *Guiccardine*'s XIth Book, he says: *Pope* Julius, *toward the End of his Life, had, in the Name of the Council,* (*viz.* Lateran) *compos'd a Decree, by which the Title of* Most Christian *was to be transferred to the King of* England *and his Successors; the King of* France *to be depriv'd of all Royal Dignity, and his Kingdom proscrib'd. But* (continues he) *God by his Death prevented these pernicious Designs.* A little further *Cabbasute* cites *Peter Bembus*'s Twelfth Book of the *Venetian* History; whence, to shew the implacable Hatred of this Pope to the *French*, he endeavoured, by making a League with the Emperor *Maximilian* and *Venetians*, with their joint Forces, utterly to extirpate that Nation: *Adeo violentis voluntatibus agitabatur*, says *Cabbasutius*, *ib.* And a little before he expired, he adjur'd the Cardinals present not to suffer his Successor to be chosen by the Council, but by the Conclave. After a troublesome Reign of Ten Years he resign'd his Breath; of whom the

Editors ſay nothing; though they ſeldom fail to ſpeak ſomething well of the worſt of their Popes; but here they are ſilent; only *Caranza* in his *Sum. Concil. p.* 883. ſays, *Julius II. Papa moritur bellicâ gloriâ clarus*; a Compliment very unſuitable to the Character of the *Servus Servorum Dei.*

[1513.] Before we proceed to the remaining Seſſions of the *Lateran* Council, we will take in ſomething of the Life of Pope *Leo* X. who was promoted to the Pontificate between the Fifth and Sixth Seſſions of it. He was before call'd *John Medices*, a *Florentine* by Nation, of the famous Family of the *Medices.* Whilſt he was but an Infant, *Lewis* XI. of *France*, out of Reſpect to his Father *Laurence Medices*, beſtowed an Archbiſhoprick on him; and when he was but 13 Years old, Pope *Innocent* VIII. made him a Cardinal. Afterwards the Family of the *Medices* being oppreſſed by *Charles* VIII. of *France*, and the *Florentines* in but a low Condition, *John Medices* was forced to quit *Rome*, and travel. About the Year 1503. returning to *Rome*, he was ſoon taken into the Favour of Pope *Julius* II. whoſe Intereſt he purſued to the laſt, and after his Death trod in his Steps. He was firſt made Pope *Julius*'s Legate at *Bononia*, taken Priſoner, *A. D.* 1512. by the *French* at the Battle of *Ravenna*, and being brought to *Milan* at the Time that the Council of *Piſa* had remov'd thither, he was very troubleſome to them. At laſt eſcaping by a Stratagem from the Hands of the *French*, he betook himſelf to his own Province; and *A. D.* 1513. *Ætatis* 37. he is by the junior Cardinals choſen Pope by the Name of *Leo* X. The *Lateran* Council, begun by his Predeceſſor *Julius*, he continued, not only to oppoſe the Council of *Piſa*, but to delay the Reformation of the Church, ſo earneſtly at that Time deſired by all *Chriſtendom.* All Things in this Council obey the Pontifical Nod; and he is ſure to be rewarded

 moſt,

moſt, who can by ſome extraordinary Expedient advance the Grandeur of the Apoſtolick See, and depreſs the Power of Councils.

The Sixth Seſſion began *March* 11. wherein Pope *Leo* himſelf preſided, and little or nothing was done beſides the reading of the *Florentine*'s Mandate for adhering to the Council.

The Seventh *Seſſion* was *June* 17. in which the Mandates of the King of *Poland* and other Princes were read to the ſame Purpoſe; but ſent no Prelates to the Council: Wherefore hitherto this Synod was compos'd of nothing but meer Creatures of the Court of *Rome*. In this Seſſion the *ſafe Conduct*, which the *French* deſired in the Caſe of the *Pragmatick Sanction*, was put off till

The Eighth Seſſion, which was *December* 19. 1513. where firſt is publiſhed the Mandate of King *Lewis* XII. with the Procuration made to Cardinal *Frederic* and others, impowering them to abjure in his Name the *Piſan* Council: For the King upon Pope *Julius*'s Death being deſirous of recovering the Dutchy of *Milan*, and other Lordſhips in *Italy*, endeavours to cultivate a Friendſhip with Pope *Leo* X. Wherefore he impowers his foreſaid Proctors to declare: *That he*, Lewis XII. *never adher'd to the* Piſan *Council with Deſign to make any Deceſſion from the Church of* Rome *and the Apoſtolick See, but only to defend himſelf againſt the Malice and Injuries of Pope* Julius. Therefore the Cauſe of this Difference being buried with him, *he freely and heartily renounc'd the* Piſan *Council, and would adhere to the* Lateran, *as the only, true, and lawful Synod; promiſing to ſend ſome Prelates of* France *to it.* In which Declaration, ſays *Richerius*, *ib. p.* 12. we muſt obſerve, That the Pope and the Apoſtolick See were Two diſtinct Things; as were likewiſe the Church and the Court of *Rome*: To juſtify which, he produces the Authority of ſeveral Canoniſts; moſt of

of whom, by the way, were not Men of the honeſteſt Stamp: For let *Richerius*, and an Army of Canoniſts at his Heels, diſtinguiſh ever ſo nicely, they all make *Lewis* XII. but a very Juggler, protecting the *Piſan* Council no longer than it conſiſted with his Intereſt, and renouncing it when he thought it no longer of Uſe to him. This I think his own Words explain, when he ſays, *he adher'd to the* Piſan *Council only to defend himſelf from the Malice and Injuſtice of Pope* Julius. This indeed is not anſwerable to the Character *Richerius* has hitherto given of this Prince; not but ſuch a Diſtinction has been between the Church and the Court of *Rome*, and between the Pope and the Apoſtolick See; for, as has been before allowed, a Man may oppoſe the Pope, and yet be within the Pale of the Church, and in a State of Salvation. However let the Reader judge; it was Matter of Fact, which, without Offence to Truth, I could not omit. Whilſt theſe Things, and others of the like Nature, were carrying on at *Rome*, King *Lewis* XII. pays the laſt Debt to Nature; in whoſe Character *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 570. *col.* 2. is moſt extravagant: But *Richerius* is more ſincere, *ib. p.* 14. for, firſt begging Pardon for entering into the Secrets of Princes, he tells an honeſt Truth of this excellent Prince, for a Warning to others, tenderly pitying his Weakneſs, without reproaching his Memory. *It was the great Misfortune of that incomparable Prince* Lewis *to be ſo expenſively liberal to Pope* Alexander VI. *and his wicked Family, eſpecially to that Monſter of Mankind,* Cæſar Borgia, *on whom he ſpar'd no Coſt, ſo he might procure his Father Pope* Alexander's *Favour in recovering the Dutchy of* Milan *and Kingdom of* Naples, *at a Time when he ought rather to have promoted the Reformation. Hence we may learn how dangerous the Friendſhip of wicked Men is, and how pernicious their Familiarity is to Chriſtian Princes.*

This Seſſion there were frequent Complaints made to the Pope againſt the ſevere Exactions of the Court of *Rome*; to remedy which, his Holineſs promiſed he would take Care to have them reduced to their primeve Inſtitution; and accordingly orders his Bull upon this Matter to be approv'd in Council; to which ſome conſented, and others not. *Potentinus* was pleaſed with the Bull, but wanted to ſee the Articles of Reformation: Another lik'd the Bull, but not the Reformation, until it were heard and publiſh'd. Others ſaid, they were pleas'd, provided the Reformation were but general. Alas! How different is this from the Practice of the ancient Fathers and Councils, when the State of the Church was Ariſtocratical; for then, duly conſidering and weighing Matters, every one ſingly gave his Opinion, and ſubſcrib'd to the Acts; and when the Votes were caſt up, the Synod made their Concluſion from the Majority. But here the Caſe is alter'd; for the Pope, like an abſolute Monarch in the Church, offers to the Synod what he had in his Cabinet reſolved on, to be without Examination approv'd, and obtain the Force of a Synodical Decree: Which Method Cardinal *Bellarmine* is mightily in love with, *l.* 1. *de Concil. & Eccleſ. c.* 9. and ſays it ought above all to be obſerv'd: And no Wonder truly, ſince this is the only Prop that ſupports the imaginary Infallibility of that abſolute Monarchy.

The Ninth *Seſſion* began *May* 5. 1514. in which is read the King of *Portugal*'s Mandate, declaring his adhering to the Lateran Council: Likewiſe the Procuration of the *Gallican* Prelates, wherein they declare, in the Name of the whole *Gallican* Church and State, of what State or Condition ſoever, that they renounce the *Piſan* Council, (already diſſolv'd) and, in Obedience to the Apoſtolick Mandates, and the Mino-

Monitory of the *French* King, they would adhere to the *Lateran* Council, *&c.* *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 202. *& seq.*

The Tenth *Session* was held *May* 4. 1515. in which, amongst other Bulls and Edicts, there is one, *ibid. p.* 252. against those who pretended themselves *Exempts*; against whom the Pope appoints the Ordinary of the Place to proceed, and to send the Process under his Seal to the Court of *Rome*. This is a meer Illusion of Ecclesiastick Jurisdiction, and the most certain Way to confirm the absolute Monarchy of the Pope; for admitting this, Bishops are no more than the Pope's Proctors and Commissaries. But then further this Bull says, that these Ordinaries shall send the Processes aforesaid at the Charge of the *Exempts*. This is putting the Sickle into another's Harvest, and giving Bishops Power in Temporal Affairs. But what if these *Exempts* should prove Mendicants, or such as have no Temporal Goods, must the Bishops inform at their own Expence? And yet, notwithstanding the Unreasonableness of this Necessity, it was agreed to by the whole Council except the Bishop of *Trani*, who gave his Reasons for his Dissent.

There is in the same *Session* a Bull published about the Printing of Books, *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 257. wherein it is decreed, That no Book be offer'd to the Press before it pass the Censure of the Apostolick Vicar, or Master of the holy Palace; and in other Cities, of the Bishop of the Diocese, or his Vicar; otherwise, besides Confiscation and Burning of the Books, the Printer shall pay an Hundred Ducats towards the Fabrick of the Prince of the Apostles. But it may be noted here, that the Pope, as Bishop and Pope, has no Right to exact pecuniary Mulcts, but only as a political Prince; and therefore his Decrees and Bulls of this Kind are not binding out of the Dominions of the Court of *Rome*. There are many useful Ar-

guments urg'd by *Richerius* against the Abrogation of the *Pragmat ck Sanction*, and the Institution of the *Concordat* between King *Francis* I. and Pope *Leo* X. which for Brevity's Sake I must omit, and sum up the rest of this Council in short.

Lewis XII. having a little before his Death set a fatal Example of renouncing the best of his Actions, his Son-in-Law and Successor, *Francis* I. as unhappily imitates him; for as *Lewis* XII. had it in his Power, after the Battle of *Ravenna* and other Advantages, to prescribe what Laws he pleas'd to the Conquer'd, so *Francis* I. at the Battle of *Marignan*, wherein he slew 15000 of his Enemies, when he might have compell'd Pope *Leo* and his Confederates to accept what Terms he had pleas'd, instead of making a right Use of his Victory, is wheedled into a Peace by Pope *Leo*, at the Inducement of his Mother, who had a great Influence over him; for he being not Twenty Years old, was persuaded by her, that it was impossible for the Kingdom of *France* to enjoy any Peace, or him to keep the Dutchy of *Milan*, unless he made the Pope and Court of *Rome* his Friends: Which he could never hope for so long as he suffered the *Pragmatick Sanction*, that is, the Decrees of the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, to prevail in *France*. Besides which, to tickle the youthful Vanity of this Prince, Pope *Leo* promised him the Empire of the World, and would immediately confer upon him the empty Title of Emperor of *Constantinople*. Thus *Richerius* out of *Belleforest*, and other Writers of those Times. Moreover, to varnish these political Designs of Pope *Leo* with a more specious Pretence, King *Francis* is impowered by the Holy See to exact the Tenth of the Clergy's Revenue to carry on the War against the Turk. Upon these and such-like Motives the King is persuaded to relinquish the *Pragmatick Sanction*; for the Gaining of which, the Court of *Rome* had

near

near an Hundred Years employed all her Arts and Arms both Spiritual and Temporal. In ſhort, the Intereſt of the *Gallican* Church loſt Ground under the Adminiſtration of this young King, by that *Infamous Concordat* which he made with Pope *Leo*, *A. D.* 1515. whereby he obliged the *Gallican* Clergy to renounce the *Piſan* Council, and adhere to the *Lateran*. Tho' in the Year 1517. the *Gallican* Church in the Parliament of *Paris* proteſted againſt it in the Preſence of King *Francis*, and diſapprov'd the Abrogation of the *Pragmatick Sanction*: the Univerſity of *Paris* likewiſe in the ſame Year appeal to a future Council for the Vindication of the Rights of the *Gallican* Church; (*vide Richer. Hiſt. Con. General. l.* 4. *par.* 2. *p.* 30, 44.) and to this Day diſown the *Lateran* Council, and daſh it out of the Number of œcumenical Councils. And to ſhew the Inſincerity of the Editors, (ſome of which were then living, and others who wrote after) they take no Notice of theſe Two Inſtruments, either that of the *Gallican* Church in the Parliament of *Paris*, or the Appeal of the Univerſity: For the Recovery of which we are beholden to the honeſt Sorboniſt *Richerius*, *ibid.* In fine, there were ſcarce Sixty Biſhops preſent at this *Lateran* Council, and moſt of them *Italians*, entire Creatures of the Court of *Rome*, and from whom nothing but what tended to its Advancement could be expected; the Intereſt of the Catholick Church being the leſt of their Care.

And now let us conſider the fatal Conſequences of the Loſs of this *Palladium*, the *Pragmatick Sanction*. Whilſt it was in Force, the Affairs of the *Gallican* Church and Nation ſucceeded proſperouſly: But it was no ſooner abrogated, than an immenſe Swarm of Misfortunes, like thoſe of *Pandora*'s Box, invaded them on all Sides. When thoſe Sacred Elections, propagated by the Apoſtles and Fathers of the Church, in Proceſs of Time began to be neglected in *France*,

that pious Prince *Lewis* IX. (call'd *the Saint*) by his *Pragmatick Sanction*, reviv'd and entirely restor'd them: Though the Court of *Rome* was no sooner remov'd to *Avignon*, but they immediately struck at it, as like to prove a terrible obstacle to their growing Greatness. However, notwithstanding all their Stratagem and Power, *Charles* VII. about the Year 1422. again recover'd it, and studiously supported it; for which he fail'd not of his Reward in this World; God Almighty blessing his Affairs with such Success, that the *English* strangely quitted most of the Cities and Provinces of *France*, which they had for many Years been possess'd of: And this not so much by Force of Arms, as a sensible Diminution of Conduct in that warlike Nation; which otherwise is not us'd so easily to relinquish their Hold.

There is an old Legend in *France*, (whether true or false is not the Matter, since the Fact it pretended prov'd true) which says, That *Ludovisia* of *Savoy*, Mother of King *Francis*, having no Children, had a great Veneration for S. *Francis de Paula*; by the Help of whose Prayers she obtained a Son; for which Reason she call'd his Name *Francis*. This holy Man S. *Francis de Paula*, some time before he died, foretold, That this *Francis* of *Valois*, Son to *Ludovisia*, should be King of *France*: That he should exceed all the Princes of his Age in Glory, Wealth, and Happiness, provided he applied himself sincerely to the Reformation of the Church; but if he neglected or declined it, he would prove the most unfortunate Prince living: Which (whoever was the Prophet) prov'd literally true; for from the Time that King *Francis* revers'd the Decrees of the Council of *Constance* and *Basil*, What Misfortunes, what Calamities did not befal that Prince? It may be consider'd indeed, that at that Time he was not Twenty Years of Age; and that it was not so much his own Inclination

tion as the Inducement and Perſuaſion of others, that prevail'd with him to reverſe the *Pragmatick Sanction*; his Aim being no other than a laſting Peace: However, as laſting and firm a Peace as he expected it to have been, neither he nor any of his Family ever enjoy'd it; and thoſe Signiories in *Italy*, which he was above all Things fond of keeping, he ſoon loſt, and none of his Succeſſors could ever recover. As for Pope *Leo* X. who had betray'd this young King into theſe Inconveniencies, he had no ſooner gain'd his Point in eſtabliſhing the *Concordat* in *France* according to his Mind, but, notwithſtanding his former Promiſes of making *Francis* Emperor, and ſeeming to be juſt about to confer the Title of Emperor of *Conſtantinople* upon him, he ſhamefully relinquiſhes his Intereſt, advances *Charles* King of *Spain* to the Empire, and arms againſt *France*. It may be further obſerved of this unhappy Prince, that though he had many Children and Nephews, to outward Appearance of healthy and ſtrong Conſtitutions, yet from the Date of the *Concordat* they held the Crown of *France* ſcarce Sixty ſix Years, and were taken off in the Flower of their Age. His Son *Francis* the Dauphin was the firſt Inſtance in this Kind of God's Diſpleaſure, being taken off by a poiſon'd Draught, intended againſt the whole Royal Family at the ſame Time, ſo dangerous is it for Chriſtian Princes to turn their Backs upon God, and truſt to their own Councils, and the Arm of Fleſh. As for King *Francis* himſelf, when he was at the Point of Death, being deeply ſenſible of the Weight of God's Judgments, and that he had by his Prevaricating drawn theſe Misfortunes and the Hatred of the Clergy upon himſelf, calls for his Son *Henry*, and with Tears charges him to reſtore the Rights of the Church, and to take Care to ſee them faithfully obſerv'd throughout the whole Kingdom. *Nicolas Gillius*, a Nobleman of *France*, and Hiſtorian of thoſe Times, relates,

relates, That in the Reign of *Francis* I. the Ecclesiasticks neglecting the Care of their Flocks, and forsaking that Simplicity and Purity of Life which they had before practised, turn Court-Sollicitors for larger Preferments, and laying aside all religious Austerities, grow in Love with the Luxury of it. This pestilent Corruption infected all Orders of the Kingdom, and the Substance of every Province was exhausted to supply the Extravagance of the Court. Whilst the *Pragmatick Sanction* was in Force, all Bishops, Abbots, and other Prelates, kept within their own Districts, and spent the Incomes of their Benefices in their own Provinces. The Poor were cherished, holy Edifices repaired, and new Ones erected; but under the unhappy Administration of King *Francis* all Things were sacrificed to the Luxury of the Court. And whereas before, according to the Right of Sacred Elections, one Man was intrusted with but one Benefice, now Pluralities, and those incompatible too, are heap'd together to gratify the Wantonness of one Man. *Commendams*, that Pest of Ecclesiastick and Monastick Discipline, and fatal Calamity of the Church's Inheritance, were now confirm'd into a solid and perpetual Title. Nor was it the Calamity of the Church only; the same Strain of Impiety affected the State; all Places and Promotions in Judicial Courts and otherwise are put to Sale. But above all, What a vast Extent of Dominion did the *Italians* recover from *France*? Of which, besides the Graves of their Ancestors, and such-like Monuments of Misery, the *French* possess nothing to this Day: And, what is most deplorable, they retain none of the *Italians* Virtues, but their Vices, their subtil mercenary Arts.

Ecclesiastick Annals afford few Instances of any promoted to the Pontifical Dignity so young as *Leo* X. he being but Six and thirty Years old. And though he lived the Life of Sense to the highest Degree, denying

nying himſelf nothing that might contribute to his Pleaſure, or gratify his luxurious Humour, a very Atheiſt in Practice, and naturally cruel, yet the Editors in their Account of his Life, *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 364. make him a perfect Saint, calling him Merciful, a Lover of Juſtice and Religion, *&c.* Though their own Hiſtorians, who wrote Matter of Fact, plainly tell us the contrary; particularly *Guiccardine*, *l.* 14. who ſays, " That when *Leo* received the News of " the Defeat of the *French* by the *Spaniards*, and " their Loſs of *Milan*, he expired with Joy." And his avaritious mercenary Temper was ſo notorious at that Time, that *Sannazarius*, an *Italian* Poet, could not forbear throwing this ſarcatical Diſtich at him:

Sacra ſub extrema ſi fortè requiritis hora
Cur Leo non potuit ſumere, vendiderat.

" Pope *Leo* at his Death could not receive
" The Hoſt, for he had ſold it whilſt alive.

But to return to the Thread of our Story. Pope *Leo*, beſides *Ludoviſia* of *Savoy* the King's Mother, had another Inſtrument very uſeful in the debauching young King *Francis* I. and that was *Prata* the Chancellor, by whoſe wicked Council the King was chiefly influenced in the Affair of the *Concordat*, or *Pacta Bononenſia*: By which this mercenary Wretch ſo highly merited of the Pope, that he beſtow'd on him a Cardinal's Hat, and the Office of perpetual Legate in *France*: Of whoſe wicked Management the King was ſoon ſenſible; for *Prata* having laid out a vaſt Sum of Money in repairing and enlarging the Hoſpital of Invalids at *Paris*, which to this Day is call'd the Legate's Court, the King was heard to ſay openly in Preſence, " That though the Legate ſhould ſell " himſelf and all that he had for the Cure and En-

"tertainment of the Poor, he could never make "them Amends." For in robbing the Church, he had robbed the Poor of their best Friend. The Inheritance of the Church, as a celestial and inexhaustible Treasure, conferr'd not on any private Person, but entrusted to the Ecclesiastick Community, as a Sacred Depositum, was faithfully by them dispens'd, during the Right of Sacred Elections, partly in the Fabrick and Ornaments, and partly for the Support of the Ministers of the Church and Poor, and other hospitable Ends: But when the *Concordat* took Place, the whole Estate of the Church was sacrificed to the Luxury of a few, and the enriching of the Relations of Ecclesiasticks with Fortunes becoming Secular Princes.

Notwithstanding Chancellor *Prata* had made his Fortune out of the Ruine of the Church, yet his Grandeur as Cardinal or Legate could not screen him from the Resentment of the People: The Learned draw their Pens upon him with implacable Fury; the Witty make him the Subject of their Pasquinades; and the very Boys express their Abhorrence of his vile Actions upon him in Effigie. The Scholars of the Academy of *Plesse* making a Puppet of Rags, representing Chancellor *Prata*, with the utmost Contempt drag him to a Court of their College, where they accuse and condemn him as a Traitor to the Church, and deliver him to the Mob to be treated with the Ignominy he deserv'd; which, in the Height of their Resentment, they would not have fail'd to perform to his real Person, if they had had him in their Power. *Vide Genebrard's Chronology.* The same Historian makes Pope *Leo*, the King's Mother, and Chancellor *Prata*, the Authors of the Calamities which from hence befel both Church and State. However it was, that these wicked Instruments prevail'd

with

with this Prince to comply with their wicked Policies, it is certain that nothing that they propos'd or promis'd him from these Condescensions ever answer'd his Expectations. The heavy Tax of the Tenth upon the Clergy, under Pretence of carrying on the War against the *Turk*, was no more than pouring Water into a Sieve: And as to what they promis'd him, that by this and other Means he would have the Clergy of *France* wholly at his *Devoir*, by the hidden and secret Justice of God the quite contrary happen'd: For it is plain from Experience, that though the Ecclesiasticks (generally speaking) were by the Royal Munificence rais'd to the highest Pitch of Wealth and other Advantages of Fortune, yet they never heartily lov'd King *Francis* and his Family, or any of their Successors; but were entirely in the Interest of the Court of *Rome*: Of which I could name some modern Instances; but —— This was the Ground of those Complaints of King *Francis* I. against *Poncherius*, the last Archbishop of *Paris* that was promoted to that See according to the ancient Right of Sacred Elections; who, siding with the Court of *Rome* against his Prince, gave him much Trouble during the Time of his Captivity in *Spain*, and under-hand oppos'd his Enlargement all he could. The fatal Consequences of these Practices of Ecclesiasticks in Behalf of the Court of *Rome*, in Opposition (I might more properly say, Rebellion) to their own lawful Sovereigns, manifestly shew'd themselves in the civil Tumults under *Henry* III. and after the Murder of *Henry* IV. in the Minority of *Lewis* XIII. It's most demonstrably true from the Practice of all Times, in which the *Pragmatick Sanction* was in Force, that none more bravely maintained and defended the Rights of the *Gallican* Church, the Liberties of the Nation, and the Prerogative

rogative of the King against the Usurpations and Encroachments of the Court of *Rome*, than the Ecclesiasticks; but when they were let into the Secrets of that Court, they were tainted with Ambition, and soon quitted those excellent Principles that had preserv'd the Church and State independant of the Pontificate. And being thus intoxicated with Pride, Avarice, *&c.* they were so far from looking on their Natural Prince as their Liege Lord, that they advance the Supremacy of the *Roman* Pontiff above the Majesty of *France*, and its King; insomuch as, *A. D.* 1615, in a Meeting of the Three Estates of the Kingdom, they had the Impudence to maintain as a Maxim, That the Pope might depose the King of *France*; seeming to confound Heaven and Earth together to gain their Point: Which indeed they carried so far in Part, that the Order of Nobility clos'd with them in their factious Opinion. By these impious Doctrines, Subjects were taught to rebel against their lawful Kings, who are now become but so many Tributaries to the Despotick Absolute Monarchy of the Bishop of *Rome*.

The University of *Paris* having appointed a Time for inquiring into and hearing the Grievances and Calamities which the *Concordat* had occasioned, Master *John Bochard*, Syndic or Advocate of all the Universities of *France*, was appointed to open the Cause: And it being the Custom for him that was to plead any Cause, to take some Text of Scripture for the Principle of his Speech; when he endeavoured to demonstrate how earnestly all the Universities of *France* desired to be Sharers of the mournful State of the Church, and how all good Men deplored her calamitous Condition, he began with this Text, *With Desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you.* Then reckoning up the many

Ar-

Arguments againſt, and Inconveniencies of the *Concordat*, he plainly demonſtrates the Nullity of it; that it was carried by a high Hand, contrary to all Law or rightful Order; and that being finiſh'd and ſign'd the ſame Day with the Abrogation of the *Pragmatick Sanction*, it was plain the Court of *Rome* was reſolv'd by Force to abrogate the Right of Sacred Elections, and not allow the *Gallican* Church any previous Examination of the Matter. But this honeſt Orator might as well have been ſilent, for he had no ſooner ended his Speech, but he is committed to ſafe Cuſtody. It was not only the Opinion of *Richerius*, *ib. p.* 58. but of very many good and learned Men, that the Abrogation of theſe Bulwarks and Mounds of the Church, was the deepeſt Stab ſhe ever received, worſe than any Thing that *Luther* or *Calvin* were capable of doing. As for *Richerius*'s Opinion of *Martin Luther* and *John Calvin*, it was the ſame with thoſe who wrote for a Reformation in the Practice and Morals of Churchmen, but were ſtill for retaining ſeveral erroneous Doctrines, ſuch as Tranſubſtantiation, Invocation of Saints, *&c.* Undoubtedly had they reform'd without Sacrilege, and reviv'd the ancient Method of Church-Government without a total Subverſion of Diſcipline, the Church would ſoon have put on her Primitive Purity, and all Things have moved in their proper Spheres; but now being diveſted of thoſe Fortifications, which were her ſole Defence, Inundations of Irregularities and Enormities flow in upon her, and ſhe is, like a City taken by an Enemy, ſtrip'd of all Power and Diſcipline. "Hence, ſays *Genebrard*, proceeded the Ruine of "*France* (tho' we may rather ſay of the whole "Church); hence the many Hereſies, Simonies, "Commendams, Fiduciaries, and other mercenary "Arts; hence an Extirpation of Learning, Vir-

"tue,

" tue and Piety, and a *Babyloniſh* Confuſion in the " Main:" Which ſoon put an End to the Apoſtolick Diſcipline, depriv'd the Church of that common Right and ordinary Miſſion inſtituted by God, diſpens'd with the Reſidence of Paſtors, which is of Divine and Natural Right, and in fine hath let a general Corruption into the Hierarchy, and done an unſpeakable Dammage to Chriſtianity. The End to which all this tends is, that the Biſhop of *Rome* is Supreme and Infallible, that either as a Pope or private Perſon he cannot Err. Thus *Bellarmine, l. 4. de Rom. Pontiff. cap. 6. Item Papam neque in Approbatione Religioſorum, neque in Canonizatione Sanctorum errare poſſe.* Thus to confirm this Infallibility in the Pope, have they trampled upon the whole State of the Church as it was inſtituted by Chriſt and his Apoſtles; and leaſt any one ſhould be ſo hardy as to gainſay or oppoſe this Heterodoxy, they declare him an Heretick and Schiſmatick that ſhall dare to imagine any Thing to the contrary. But alas! what poor Security can earthly Politicks give to ſuch impious Actions? The Wolf cannot conceal his Voracity in the Sheep's Cloathing; and the Butcher does but awkardly act the Shepherd. And therefore, notwithſtanding all the Artifice humane Nature could invent to skreen their wicked Practices from the World, that People might not know that Emendation was abſolutely wanted in the Church, and that tho' all good Men, for above Two hundred Years, had earneſtly ſolicited for a Reformation, yet nothing was done towards it; at laſt the Almighty, through his wonderful and unſearchable Providence, brought all Things to Light, and expoſed them to the View of all Men. For the very ſame Year that the Decrees of the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, together with the *Pragmatick Sanction*, were by Pope *Leo* X. abrogated in

the *Lateran* Council, *Luther* preach'd against that scandalous Practice of getting Money by Indulgences. This was one of Pope *Leo*'s Projects to fill his Treasury; for employing *Tezellius*, a *Dominican* Monk in *Germany*, and others in other Parts, to preach up the Benefit of Indulgences, they acquir'd immense Sums of Money by it; which these Ecclesiastick Hucksters carried on with a most unparallel'd Impudence, perswading the People, that by Vertue of these Indulgences, not only the Living, but the Dead were absolved from all Sin and Punishment, and were in an immediate State of Salvation. *Cav. Hist. Lit. Par.* 2. *p.* 205. *Luther* attacks them with no less Success than Bravery, insomuch that *Tezellius* and his Companions charge *Luther* with Heresy, and threaten him with the Faggot. But *Luther* finding himself able to maintain his Arguments, offers his Adversaries to refer the Matter in Debate between them to the Bishop of the Diocess, and the Provincial of his own Order, or to the Censure of Pope *Leo*. In the mean Time *Luther* is assaulted from all Quarters, the great *Diana* lying now at Stake; and therefore *Eckius*, *Prierias*, *Hockstratus*, and others, not only revile him, but advise the Pope to have him burnt. This rous'd *Luther*, who was naturally warm, and impatient of Injuries; and sitting hard to his Study, he made it his Business to discover all the Fallacies and Errors of the Church of *Rome*, which he failed not to let the World know; for the more they threatned him, the more he grew incens'd; and when Cardinal *Cajetan*, the Apostolick Legate, had summon'd and commanded him to renounce his Opinion, he told him he did not through Obstinacy maintain or assert any Thing; but what the Holy Scriptures taught him he would observe, being ready in all Things to abide by the Judgment of the Church,

 for

for which he appeals to the Pope, and at last from the Pope to a General Council. During all which Time he was not idle, for making daily Discoveries of the wicked Morals of Ecclesiasticks and their erroneous Principles, he at last falls foul on the Pope's Supremacy, Purgatory, Indulgences, *&c.* in the Dispute between him and *Eckius*; which at once put all *Europe* in a Flame. To quench which,

[1522.] Pope *Adrian* VI. (a Man of much Piety and Goodness, (and who would not, like his Predecessors, change his Name) sends Instructions to *Cheregate*, his Legate, to propose to the Princes of *Germany*, in the Assembly at *Nuremburg*, some Expedients for the Reformation of the Church, which was absolutely necessary at this Time. In which the *German* Princes readily concur with his Holiness; and, if we may believe *Ciaconius*, who wrote the Life of this Pope, he certainly intended to call a General Council for the Reformation of the Church, if God had pleased to spare his Life. For, reflecting upon the Practices of the Court of *Rome*, he was often heard to say to his two Favourites *Encurtius* and *Hezius*, "The Bishops of *Rome* had a "very hard Task of it; for Matters were come to "that Pass now, that tho' the Church extremely "wanted Reforming, and he most desirous of it, "yet it could not be done; since the Corruptions "and Abuses were confirm'd into a Sort of a Law "by long Practice." But however just and piously inclin'd Pope *Adrian* might have been,

[1523.] *Clement* VII. his Successor, and who reviv'd the old Custom of changing Names, (he being before called *Julian* of *Medicis*) is of a different Opinion to his Predecessor, and would usually express himself a contrary Way, saying, "That "as in the first Ages of the Church the frequent

"Ce-

"Celebration of Councils added fresh Power to "the Pontifical Authority: So in these latter "Times Councils diminish'd its Majesty: For "which Reason modern Popes made it their Busi-"ness as much to decline the calling them, as for-"mer Popes did to procure them." And upon this Maxim *Clement* VII. during his Pontificate, which lasted near Eleven Years, as industriously avoided calling a General Council, as the whole Christian World earnestly desired it: Which, tho' it made his Reign very troublesome to his Neighbours, gave *Luther* and others a favourable Opportunity of propagating the Reformation. But this was the Opinion but of One Pope: His Successor, [1534.] *Paul* III. (before called *Alexander*) thinks otherwise; for seeing *Lutheranism* (as they call it) daily get Ground, and Complaints against the Court of *Rome* increase from all Quarters, notwithstanding the Practice of Modern Popes, he finds himself under a Necessity of reforming both the *Roman* Church and Court, which he publickly notify'd. In Order to which he commissions a Council of Nine, (whereof Four were Cardinals, the other Five Bishops or other Prelates) to draw up Articles to shew the Necessity of a Reformation. The chief of which are:

1. The Abuse of Ordinations, in ordaining illiterate, mean and immoral Persons to the Priesthood, and very often Children to that Sacred Character.

2. The unjust Collation of Benefices, even of Bishopricks, on such who, by reason of uncanonical Distance, could not execute the Pastoral Care required.

3. The mean Pensions allow'd by Persons benefic'd.

4. Simoniacal Commutations of Benefices for Lucre's Sake.

5. The Abuſe of robbing the Church of its Goods, by Bequeathment, which no Teſtator has Right to do, *&c.*

6. Promiſe or Reſervation of Benefices before a Vacancy; whereby the Death of the Incumbent is wiſh'd for.

7. Pluralities of Cures, eſpecially Biſhopricks.

8. The Incompatibility of Cardinalſhip and Epiſcopacy, the Office of the latter being to attend his Flock.

9. The Abſence of Cardinals from the Court of *Rome*, where their Attendance is required.

10. The Irregularities of Religious Orders.

11. The Abuſes of Monaſteries for Women, ſubject to the Convents, and not to their proper Biſhops.

12. Profane and vain Diſputes of Philoſophy n Publick Schools, with ſeveral others.

The Proem to theſe Articles would fain ſeem to ſupport the Supremacy of the Pope in this Neceſſity of Reforming, tho' it is the very Source and Root of all theſe Abuſes; and tho' in their particular Addreſs to the Pope, in the very Words of St. *Paul*, they call him *Diſpenſator*, or Steward; not *Dominus*, or Lord. *Richer. l.* 4. *Par.* 2. *p.* 72. Yet in the next Page they uſe this nice Diſtinction, *The Office of the Univerſal Biſhop, and that of the Biſhop of* Rome. Not conſidering what they afterwards aſſert in the Article of the Incompatibility of Biſhops and Cardinals; wherein they ſay, *It is to no Purpoſe to correct the Abuſes of others, if they do not reform in the chief Members. ibid. p.* 76. in which Number it's to be hop'd they include the Biſhop of *Rome*, or elſe they exclude him from being a Member of the Church.

Where-

Whereas, by the Acts of the Councils of the Primitive Church, we find it was the Practice of the Fathers to give an Account not only of what preceded, but follow'd those Councils (of which the First Council of *Ephesus*, *Chalcedon*, *&c.* give undeniable Proof). *Richerius*, *ib. p.* 71. deplores, that in an Age wherein the Art of Printing flourish'd, all the Acts of the Council of *Trent* were not faithfully publish'd. The Occasion and Foundation of which Council were the *Commentarii Fiduciæ* of Pope *Adrian* VI. to *Cheregate* the Apostolick Nuncio in *Germany*, and the Articles of the Council of Nine by Order of Pope *Paul* III. Which was the Motive for *Peter Crabb* the *Franciscan*'s prefixing the Articles of the Council of Nine to the Council of *Trent* in his Collection of the Councils. He likewise, *ibid.* wonders that *Surius* the *Carthusian* should leave them out, but is not in the left surpriz'd at *Binius* for doing so, because he declares he copies after *Bellarmine* and *Baronius*, who were obstinate Asserters of the Temporal Monarchy of the Court of *Rome*, and abrogate and expunge all that make against it. Nor is it less to be admired *Labbe* and *Cossart*, in their 14th Tome of the Councils, should take no Notice of the foresaid Articles of the Council of Nine, beginning the Council of *Trent* with the Bull of Indiction, and proceeding immediately to the First Session of it. *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 725, 732.

The Council of *Trent* hath been treated of by many learned Pens already; I shall therefore, to close this Work, only take Notice of some Observations of the honest Sorbonist *Richerius* upon it, and so take my Leave.

[1545.] After many tedious Delays, and the longing Expectation of the Christian World, at the pressing Instances of the Emperor *Charles* V. and

Francis I. the Council of *Trent* began, *A. D.* 1545. under *Paul* III. during whose Pontificate Ten Sessions were held. Afterwards, *A. D.* 1551. under Pope *Julius* III. there were Six Sessions more held; tho' Pope *Julius* for two Years discontinued the Council; against the Unreasonableness of which Suspension the *Spanish* Bishops were not a little exclamatory. At last, *A. D.* 1562. under Pope *Pius* IV. the Nine last Sessions were held, and the Year following the Council was concluded. Certainly from *Constantine the Great* to this Time, nothing was more sincerely aim'd at, and desired by the whole Christian World than a Reformation: But the Method of proceeding plainly shews, That the Court of *Rome* meant no such Thing; but rather, upon the Ruine of the Church, to establish their Supremacy. This is evident from all the Champions of the Pontificate, particularly *Bellarmine, de Concil. & Eccles. cap.* 9. toward the End; namely, that it was not lawful for any one to offer any Thing in Opposition to the Proposition made by the Pope's Legates: Which are the very Words of the 17th Session, *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 840. *Placetne Concilium celebrari, &c. & in eo ea debito servato Ordine tractari, quæ PROPONENTIBUS LEGATIS, ad horum Temporum levandas Calamitates sanctæ Synodo apta videbuntur.* The Cardinals who, as Legates of the Apostolick See, presided in this Council of *Trent*, were, *Joannes Maria de Monte, Marcellus Cervinus*, and *Reginald Pool*; to whom only it was permitted to propose or offer any Thing in Council; and this was under Pretence of avoiding Confusion and Disorder, tho' in very Truth it was for no other End than to obstruct the Reformation of both Church and Court of *Rome*. But *Bellarmine*, from the Place before cited, will have the Pope, as sole, absolute, and infallible Monarch, have the

Power of making and prescribing Laws by himself and Cabinet, and then have them approv'd only in Council. And, *l.* 2. *c.* 11. *ejusdem*, he says, " The " Pope's Legates were sent to the Council of *Trent* " without Instructions, because there was such " Variety of Matter to be treated of, that it was " impossible for them to be instructed rightly. Whence *Bellarmine* would infer, That the *Trentine* Fathers, after they had deliver'd their Opinions of Matters proposed in Council, sent to *Rome* to obtain the Influence or Inspiration of the Holy Ghost for an Infallible Determination. *Vallius, de Suprem. Potest. Papæ, Par.* 4. *Quæst.* 6. is of the same Opinion: Yet both he and *Bellarmine* cannot come off clear in this, tho' they would seem to stifle and enervate the Rumours which, during the Sitting of this Council, spread every where, *viz.* " That the " Holy Ghost was evok'd from *Rome* by the *Trentine* " Fathers, and sent from thence to the Council. But let the Friends of the Pontificate express themselves how they will or can, whether the Apostolick Legates went with or without Instructions, and whether they were arbitrarily to carry their Point, or wait for a favourable Opportunity; it is plain from Matter of Fact, the Management of the Pontifical Party, and the Consequences, that *Absolute Monarchy* was the ultimate End of this Council; and to persuade the World, that Christ bestow'd or transmitted the Blessed Influences of his Spirit on the Church by he Pope alone. Which is very repugnant to the Rules laid down by our Saviour, and the Practice of the Primitive Church for the First Eight General Councils. For our Blessed Lord, *Mat.* 18. *v.* 17, 18, 19, 20. does not confine His and the Holy Ghost's Presence and Assistance to one single Person, Place, or See; but to the Church assembled in his Name. " If he will not

 " hear

"hear them, tell it unto the Church, *&c.* What-
"soever Ye shall bind, *&c.* [Not Thou, O Pope!]
"Again, If Two of you shall agree in Earth up-
"on any Thing, whatsoever they shall desire it
"shall be given them of my Father; and lastly,
"Where Two or Three shall be gathered together
"in my Name, I am there in the Midst of them.
All which Texts plainly imply, That the Holy Ghost is bestow'd on the Church diffusive, and not confin'd to the single Person and Dispensation of one Man. And this is evident from the Practice of the Apostles themselves, in the Method of holding Councils, which were not assembled by the special Mandate of St. *Peter*, but by the joint Consent of the Apostles; who, as to the Gift of the Holy Ghost, had an equal Share with him. And therefore 'tis plain, that the *Trentine* Fathers canonically assembled had no Occasion to send to *Rome* for the Illumination of the Holy Spirit to enable them to an Infallible Determination; when by Vertue of the Promises of Christ they were entitled to as great Illumination of Spirit as the Bishop of *Rome* was. But we need not wonder at this new and unheard-of Manner of Proceeding introduc'd by the *Trentine* Fathers, if we consider the Disuse of Councils, and the Encroachment of the Pontifical Absolute Monarchy over the natural Rights and Laws of the Aristocratical Government in the Church. And truly the State of Episcopacy was at this Time in *Italy* so subjugated to the arbitrary Will of the Bishop of *Rome*, and had so entire a Dependance on that See, that they dare not attempt the Recovery of that Aristocracy which alone would set them at Liberty. This Opportunity therefore the *Roman* Pontiff lays hold on, and since the World are so fond of a Council, they shall have one; but it shall consist of such a Majority

jority as ſhall not anſwer their Ends; there being triple the Number of *Italian* Biſhops to thoſe of other Provinces; as is plain from the Editions of this Council: For out of *Italy* alone there were an Hundred eighty ſeven, and out of all other Provinces and Nations only Eighty one Biſhops were preſent at it. *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 938. Therefore we may very well ſuppoſe, that the *Italian* Biſhops, who had their ſole Dependance, as Subjects, on the Court of *Rome*, would do nothing derogatory to its Intereſt. And that the Strength of the Eccleſiaſtick Monarch conſiſted in Subjects of this Kind, we have ſufficient Proof from their own Hiſtorians. *John Baptiſt Adriani*, a *Florentine*, who continued *Guiccardine*, and was Privy Counſellor to the Great Duke of *Hetruria*, declares, that *A. D.* 1562. Pope *Pius* IV. was hardly perſuaded by his Kinſman the Duke of *Hetruria* to call a Council; but at laſt being convinc'd by the Duke's Reaſons, or rather the continual repeated Sollicitations of all Chriſtian Princes, (which put him under a Sort of Neceſſity) he conſents to call a Council: But to prevent any Contradiction to his Grandeur, or Check to his Supremacy, he commands all the Biſhops of *Italy* to be preſent, that whatever Matter ſhould be ſtarted, he might have a Majority to vote in his Favour. *Claudius Eſpenſæus*, who was preſent at the Council of *Trent*, *in Comment. in Epiſtolam ad Titum*, complains againſt the Manner of proceeding in it, ſaying, That the *Italian* Biſhops out-numbring the Biſhops of all other Nations, it was in vain to expect free Synods, or a Reformation. Certainly, if the Acts of this Council (which muſt be induſtriouſly concealed or deſtroy'd) were to appear, they would diſcover many Secrets of the Court of *Rome*.

The Two General Points debated in this Council were these; 1. Doctrinal, or relating to Faith. 2. Political. In the First, not only the *Romanists*, but other Parts of the Church of *Rome* agree; tho' in the Second they differ, particularly in those new Constitutions which the Court of *Rome* had for its own private Advantage extorted. The Fathers of the First Eight General Councils preserv'd the common Right of Episcopacy and its Aristocratical Regimen, which, as truly Apostolical, they endeavoured to transmit to Posterity. But the *Italian* Bishops run quite *contra* to these Principles, and with all their Art and Strength assert the Empire of the *Roman* Pontiff over all Ecclesiastick Affairs. According to the Custom of the Primitive Church, every Bishop was to govern his Diocess conformably to the Fifth Canon of the Council of *Nice*; and that every one was to be subject to the Bishop of the Diocess within whose District he liv'd. But in the Council of *Trent* new, till now, unheard of Methods are invented, by which the Bishop of *Rome*, as Absolute Monarch, governs the Universal Church by the Bishops, who are but his *Proctors, Commissaries and Delegates*. This is evident from XXII. Sess. cap. 5, 6, 8, and XXV. Sess. cap. 9. in which the Bishops are called but *Apostolicæ Sedis Delegati*. *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 859, 900. and act but by Vertue of a Deputation from the Court of *Rome*. But since Bishops, equally with the Pope, derive their Authority immediately from God; and that he is above them in no Degree but that of Primacy, as being First Bishop, and Patriarch of the *Western* Church, certainly they can by no humane Right be deprived of that Power which they derive immediately from God.

There is one Thing worth observing of the *Trentine* Fathers, who, according to the Practice of the Court

Court of *Rome*, exact Temporal Punishments and Pecuniary Mulcts, as if our Blessed Lord had committed the Care of Secular Affairs to his Church. Nor do they enjoin these Mulcts and Punishments as a penitentiary Sentence, but as the Act of a Political Prince. And yet, supposing all this, these Penalties ought only to oblige those who are Temporal Subjects of the Pope, on the Account of St. *Peter*'s Patrimony, (which was the Gift of *Pipin* and *Charlemain*) and not as Temporal Mulcts affect the Subjects of other Princes. But the *Italian* Fathers of this Council having assum'd thus much of the Civil Power, we must not wonder to see them grasp more of it. In Sess. 25. c. 3. they empower Bishops to imprison and inflict corporal Punishments. *Con. T. ib. p.* 907. And the same Session, *cap.* 19. *ib. p.* 916. That Temporal Lord, in whose City, Land, *&c.* a Duel is fought, shall forfeit his Right.

We will now take a View of those Decrees which regard the Reformation of Morals and Ecclesiastick Discipline; and which the Christian World for above Two hundred Years had impatiently desired. But alas! Instead of that genuine and solid Emendation of the vile Corruptions they had so long laboured under, they are shamm'd with an imaginary subventaneous Reformation. For in Sess. VII. *in Decret. Reformationis*, *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 799. the Hopes of Reformation are dash'd in the Proem of the Decree in these Words, *Eadem sacrosancta Synodus, &c.* " The same Holy Synod intending to " prosecute the Business of Reformation, hath de- " creed as follows, *Salvâ semper in omnibus Aposto-* " *licæ Sedis Auctoritate*, saving the Power of the " Apostolick See. The same Thing is express'd in XXV. Sess. *cap.* 21. *ibid. p.* 917. which amounts to this, That they would reform in every Thing, but

but in what they ought, excepting the Head, which was the Part most grieved. It was originally the Practice of the Church to secure its Polity, and to make her Rules of Government firm and immovable; and all Bishops, even He of *Rome*, oblig'd by Canons. By these Proceedings it's plain, the Bishops of *Italy* were resolv'd to secure the Court of *Rome*, by checking the Reformation; which upon Enquiry would have discover'd very foul Deformities. Besides, it's plain from the frequent Currency of the Couriers, during the Sitting of this Council, from *Rome* to *Trent*, that the Business was not so much to implore the Assistance of the Holy Ghost from thence, as to bring Intelligence of Matters transacted, and remit Instructions how to manage for the Interest of the Court. But to persue the History of this Council, they gloss over their crafty Designs with the most specious Pretence of the Practice of the most ancient Councils, *viz.* that of the Residence of Pastors in their proper Districts, in Opposition to Pluralities. *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 780. *cap.* 2. "No Person, of what Dignity, "Degree, *&c.* soever, shall hold more than one "Metropolitan or Cathedral Church in Title or "Commendam. But such as should, contrary to "the Tenor of this Decree, hold more than one "Church, (if they were within the Dispensation "of the Apostolick See) should relinquish all but "the last within Six Months." This indeed is an excellent and wholesome Decree, if it were not for the *Salvâ Sedis Apostolicæ* in the Proem to this Decree of Reformation; and, which is cunningly insinuated in the Second Chapter by Way of Apostolick Dispensation. This the foresaid *Espenseus*, who with *Petrus Danesius* Bishop of *la Vour*, and Embassador of King *Francis* I. attended at the Council of *Trent*, further explains; for this Decree against holding

holding Pluralities was no ſooner publiſh'd, but Pope *Paul* III. ſets forth a Decree to the ſame Purpoſe. Upon which Decree *Eſpenſæus* diſſerts in his Commentary *in Epiſtolam ad Titum de* αἰσχροκερδείᾳ, or *Filthy Lucre*, in theſe Words, " *Paul* III. did not " in this acquieſce with the Council of Nine, *(be-* " *fore-mentioned)* ſince in the Second Chapter of " the 7th Seſſion of the Council of *Trent*, there was " Care taken againſt Pluralities, he cuts off all " with the *Salvâ ſemper in omnibus Sedis Apoſtolicæ* " *Auctoritate*. Which was indeed doing nothing at all: For, as the ſame Author goes on, " The " ſame Pope *Paul* reſerves the Profits, *(viz.* of the " relinquiſh'd Benefices*)* to himſelf, only aſſigning " a Subſiſtence for the Maintenance of the Dig- " nity. Which is quite contrary to the Intent of " the Council of Nine: For the Benefice, that is, " the Income, is as naturally annex'd to the Office, " as the Body to the Soul, one of which cannot ſub- " ſiſt without the other; and conſequently he that " bears the Character ought to enjoy the Benefice. This may be depended on as Truth, *Eſpenſæus* being Witneſs of the Matter of Fact; and, who having ſeen ſo much Trifling in the Caſe of Reformation in this Council, tho' earneſtly importun'd by Cardinal *Lotheranus*, could not be perſuaded to go to the Council in the Year 1562. truly preſaging, that they were not ſincere in the Affair of Reformation. Which *Claudius Sanctius*, his Brother Sorboniſt, (who accompanied the Cardinal to the Council of *Trent* that Year) affectionately congratulates him for. " You never were more fortunate than in " not coming hither. For had you ſeen the vile " Practices here to check the Reformation, it " would have broken your Heart. The *French* " were more ſincere and induſtrious in it than " others, who now laugh at us for the Misfortunes

" *France*

" *France* labours under, as if the Civil Wars were a
" just Judgment on her. We arriv'd here when
" the Argument in Hand was about Holy Orders.
" [This was in the Year 1563.] The *Spanish* Bi-
" shops sollicited earnestly, that the Synod would
" declare Episcopacy an Institution of Christ;
" and that Bishops were by Divine Right superior
" to Priests. In which the *French* heartily concur'd
" with them. But to prevent the Consequence of
" this honest Proposition, the *Italians* propose and
" carry several Canons in Favour of the Pope, in
" Opposition to what the *Spanish* Bishops urg'd;
" by which they pretend the Pope to be the Bi-
" shop immediately ordained of Christ, and that
" all other Bishops have no Power but what is de-
" pendant of the Power of the Pope, or of the
" Pope himself. It is impossible for me to tell you
" particularly what I have seen and heard in
" this Council. I wish, tho' at the Peril of my
" Life, I were in the *Sorbon*. *Trent, June* 15. 1563.

By that little Light *Sanctius* gives us in this short Epistle, it's plain with what a high Hand Matters were carried in Favour of the Court of *Rome*; and how insincere the Editors are in concealing the Acts of this Council; for undoubtedly *Labbé* and *Cossart* had the same Opportunity that *Richerius* had of publishing, tho' but so small a Monument as this Epistle of *Sanctius* to *Espensæus*. But they take not the left Notice of the honest Efforts of the *Spanish* or *French* Bishops in this great Affair of Episcopacy; but go on with the Business of the Canons, wherein they never fail to insert any Thing that makes for the Power and Interest of the Court of *Rome*.

Before we part with so reputable and necessary an Evidence and Eye-Witness of some of the Abuses of this Council in Relation to the Reformation;

tion; and who to the last would not drop the left of his Resentment against those that so perfidiously had oppos'd it; it may not be ungrateful to the Reader to take Notice of *Richerius*'s Observations on his Brother Sorbonist. *Con. Gen. Hist. l.* 4. *Par.* 2. *p.* 100, *& seq.*

1. The Reservation of the Pope's Authority in those Decrees which relate to the Reformation of Manners and Discipline, and his arbitrary dispensing with Canons, instead of advancing the Pontificate, lessen its natural Force; and their uneasy Care, and sollicitous negotiating the Affair, betray the Justice of it. For in Three General Councils, *viz. Pisa, Constance,* and *Basil,* it was carried against the Pope's having Power above a Council; and therefore, consequently, he cannot dispence with any Thing enacted in Council without the Advice and Consent of the Council.

2. The Declaration of Pope *Paul* III. which *Espensæus* takes Notice of, directly contradicts the Institute of the Council of Nine, (*vid. supra, ad An.* 1534.) which was drawn up and publish'd by this Pope's Command. From whence *Espensæus* observes, that the Reformation either of the Church or Court of *Rome* was utterly despaired of.

3. Instead of the Blessed Effects of Reformation, the miserable Consequences of the Want of it appeared in too many shameful Instances; particularly those scandalous Dispensations for Pluralists, some of whom held, besides the Cardinalship, Six Bishoprieks, and as many Abbies; others no less than Three Archbishopricks, and Six Abbies; and when they have been oblig'd to renounce some of their Promotions, they have not left sufficient behind them to support the Charge of the Cure. Nay this Reservation of Power in the Pope, and dispensing with positive Canons, was so ignominiously

niously prostituted to Pride and Avarice, that a certain Cardinal at his Death reserv'd Six Abbies and one Archbishoprick for his Nephew of Three Years old. These are egregious Monuments of the Church's reforming, after the Methods of the Council of *Trent*; and which are very opposite to the Articles of the Novemvirate, or Council of Nine. But to add to the Heap of Corruptions, several Noblemen and wealthy Persons obtained Dispensations from the Court of *Rome* to hold several Benefices at one Time, without doing any Thing for them: And among others, Cardinals, by Vertue of a Privilege called *OS APERTUM*, never want a Dispensation to enjoy at one Time any Benefices, however incompatible. Which Sort of Privilege only those Cardinals can have, who in Person have received their Hat from the Pope's Hand, from whose Hand likewise they take a secret Oath to maintain the Rights of the Court of *Rome*; for then, and not before, *Cardinalibus Os aperitur*, the Cardinal's Mouth is open'd; that is, he has Liberty, upon the Vacancy of the Holy See, to enter the Conclave in order to choose a new Pope; which Privilege no other Cardinal is allow'd. These are the subtil Methods by which the Court of *Rome* obliges Men to their Interest.

4. In an Edition of the Acts of the Council of *Trent*, printed at *Antwerp*, *A. D.* 1564, which was the Year after the Council ended, it appears, that Cardinal *de Monte*, one of Pope *Paul* III.'s Legates at this Council, grievously complains of innumerable Grievances crept into the Administration of the Sacraments; which he, whilst Legate, and one of the Presidents of the Council, and afterwards Pope, by the Name of *Julius* III. was so far from reforming, that all Things go on in their old Road, so that Corruptions before complain'd of, and which

were

were the real Cause of the World's desiring a General Council, instead of being amended, do here receive a Confirmation; and the Usurpations of the Court of *Rome* receive an ample Sanction.

5. The frequent Prorogation of the Council of *Trent* is very remarkable: No Council before being retarded by so many Difficulties, Ceremonies, Artifices, *&c.* Whilst the Church preserv'd its Rights, and the Aristocratical Government flourish'd, Councils were clog'd with no Delays, but enjoy'd their proper Freedom in a due Celebration. But when once the absolute Monarchy prevail'd, all ancient Rights are subdu'd to its Arbitrary Sway, Christian Charity is extinguish'd, Reformation of Abuses suppress'd, and all Things submit to the insatiate Desire of Power. Upon this Foot of Power *Julius* III. prorogues this Council for two Years, notwithstanding the earnest Instances of the *Spanish* Bishops, Twelve of which protest in Form against the Decree of Suspension of the Council. *Dat. April* 28. *A. D.* 1552. This Protest of the *Spanish* Bishops is expung'd out of the *Roman* Edition of the Council of *Trent*, and *Labbe* and *Cossart* take no Notice of it; however it is to be found in the foresaid Edition of the Council of *Trent*, printed at *Antwerp*, *A. D.* 1564. Notwithstanding the Corruption and Prevarication which prevailed so in this Council; yet, by this Protest, we see there were some who retained, or at least wish'd well to the ancient Orthodox Government of the Church, and were still for the Right of a Council's Power above that of a Pope. And certainly, till this Authority of Councils, and the Aristocratical Government of the Episcopate be reviv'd, there can be no Hope of recovering the true Discipline of the Church; but the Court of *Rome* will with its Arts prevail to suppress all Manner of Reformation.

6. All the Care of reforming the Church, and the Power of dispensing with the Canons, being left entirely to the Pope by the Council of *Trent*, all Hope of Emendation both in Church and Members were utterly laid aside. For which *Espensæus* assigns this Reason: Admit the Pope to have a mix'd Power at *Rome*, that is partly Temporal, partly Spiritual, so that none could hinder him from reforming his own Diocess and Court; yet he would find it next to an Impossibility to do it; for at *Rome* all Manner of Licentiousness and Wickedness is practis'd more impudently and barefacedly, and that with Impunity too, than any where else: So that without an entire Change, there can be no Reformation expected at *Rome*. The State of the Church being thus degenerate, instead of Amendment, after the Council of *Trent*, all Things grew worse: For that which was formerly a Transgression by Connivance, is now become a Practice confirm'd by the dispensing Power of the *Roman* Pontiff, as he shall think fit.

But to come to the Conclusion of this Council of *Trent*: In *Hervetus*'s *French* Edition of the Council of *Trent*, and in the *Antwerp* Edition of it already mentioned, Cardinal *Morone*, the Pope's Legate, just before the Acclamations of the Bishops, concludes the Council in these Words: *Placuit omnibus Patribus huic sacro Concilio Finem imponi, Confirmationemque a SS. Domino nostro peti, TRIBUS DUNTAXAT EXCEPTIS, QUI CONFIRMATIONEM SE NON PETERE DIXERUNT. Ideoque nos Apostolicæ Sedis Legati, & Præsidentes, eidem sacro Concilio Finem imponimus, &c.* The Meaning is, there were Three Bishops, who in the Conclusion of this Council would not consent to have the Pope's Confirmation of it ask'd. These, according to the foresaid Editions of the Council of *Trent*, are Cardinal *Mo-*

Morone's own Words; after which immediately follow the *Acclamations, Beatissimo Pio Papæ, &c. Long live Pope* Pius, *&c.* But the *Roman* Edition of this Council publish'd by *Manutius, A. D.* 1564. and *Labbè* and *Cossart, Con. T.* 14. *p.* 919, 920, 921, leave out *TRIBUS EXCEPTIS, &c.* and instead of them say only, *Depart in Peace,* and then subjoin the Acclamations aforesaid. Hence it is plain what we are to expect from the Court of *Rome,* who expunge and suppress every Thing that opposes their usurp'd Rights. As for these Three Bishops who refused the Pope's Confirmation of this Council, they seem'd to retain something of the Primitive Temper in these Times of Latitude; for the Pope's Confirmation of the Acts of the ancient Councils was not desir'd, but within his own District. It being certain that Christ, in *Mat.* 16. promis'd his Presence not to one single Person alone, but to the Communion of Saints; and the Words, *Where Two or Three are gather'd together in my Name, I am there in the Midst of them,* exclude all Singularity.

F I N I S.

THE

INDEX.

A.

Ana-

INDEX.

B.

INDEX.

C.

Con-

D.

INDEX.

E.

F.

G. Gaius

G.

H.

Ho-

J.

In-

INDEX.

K.

L.

Lay-

INDEX.

M.

N.

O.

P.

INDEX.

R.

Refor-

INDEX.

S.

Sergius

INDEX.

T. Telef-

T.

V.